

The Princeton Theological Review

CONTENTS

"Miserable Sinner Christianity" in the Hands of the Rationalists. Article III.	545
BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD	
The Ritschlians and the Preëxistence of Christ. Part II.	611
JAN KAREL VAN BAALEN	
An Interpretation of Isaiah XL. 3.	638
JOHN D. DAVIS	
The Name Joseph	646
OSWALD T. ALLIS	
The Churchmanship of William Henry Roberts	660
J. ROSS STEVENSON	
Reviews of Recent Literature	666
Survey of Periodical Literature	700

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
PRINCETON

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1920

The Princeton Theological Review

EDITED FOR

THE FACULTY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BY

OSWALD T. ALLIS

Each author is solely responsible for the views expressed in his article
Notice of discontinuance must be sent to the Publishers; otherwise subscriptions will be continued

Subscription \$2.00 a year, 60 cents a copy, for the U. S. A. and Canada

Foreign postage 50 cents additional

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter at Princeton, N. J.

BOOKS REVIEWED

BARTON, G. A., <i>The Religion of Israel</i>	673
BOREHAM, F. W., <i>Mountains in the Mist</i>	690
BOREHAM, F. W., <i>Mushrooms on the Moor</i>	690
BUSHNELL, J. E., <i>Summit Views and other Sermons</i>	684
CHELEY, F. H., <i>Overland For Gold</i>	698
COATES, J. R., <i>The Christ of Revolution</i>	667
COOKE, G. W., <i>The Social Evolution of Religion</i>	668
CRAWFORD, A. W., <i>Germany's Moral Downfall</i>	670
CROSTHWAITE, A., <i>The Second Epistle to the Corinthians</i>	681
DAVIES, T. H., <i>Spiritual Voices in Modern Literature</i>	690
DENNETT, T., <i>A Better World</i>	669
FISKE, C., <i>The Perils of Respectability</i>	684
GIBBONS, H. A., <i>The New Map of Asia, 1900-1919</i>	692
GORDON, S. D., <i>Quiet Talks on the Deeper Meaning of the War and its Relation to our Lord's Return</i>	682
GRAVES, F. P., <i>What Did Jesus Teach?</i>	683
HOUSE, E. L., <i>The Drama of the Face</i>	683
HUNTING, W. B., <i>The Obligation of Contracts Clause of the United States Constitution</i>	690
JOHNSON, C., <i>The Care of Documents and Management of Archives</i>	692
JONES, R. M., <i>The Story of George Fox</i>	689
KRAPP, G. P., <i>Pronunciation of Standard English in America</i>	697
MCLEOD, M. J., <i>Songs in the Night</i>	685
MARSHALL, H. R., <i>Mind and Conduct</i>	671
PECK, G. C., <i>Forgotten Faces</i>	685
PFATTEICHER, E. P., <i>Sermons on the Gospels, Advent to Trinity..</i>	686
<i>Religion Among American Men</i>	686
SCHALLER, J., <i>Biblical Christology</i>	677
SMITH, H. M., <i>The Training of the Clergy</i>	681
Tolstoï, Léon, <i>Journal Intime, 1895-1910</i>	699
WEBBER, A. B., <i>Apt Illustrations of Public Addresses</i>	689
WOODHOUSE, A. S., <i>The Relation between Religion and Science</i>	666
WYLIE, R. C., <i>Collapse of Christless Civilizations</i>	689

The Princeton Theological Review

OCTOBER, 1920

"MISERABLE-SINNER CHRISTIANITY" IN THE HANDS OF THE RATIONALISTS

III. WINDISCH AND THE END

The assault on the Reformation conception of the Christian life could not end on so ambiguous a note as that struck by Pfeiderer. On the contrary, what may very properly be spoken of as the last word said in furtherance of it, was the most direct that had been said since Wernle's own, and in many respects the most forceful and telling of all. We are referring, of course, to Hans Windisch's at once brilliant and ponderous volume on *Baptism and Sin in the Oldest Christianity up to Origen*,¹ which was published in 1908. We have already pointed out the relation of the book to Wernle's published twelve years before. It came into the controversy which Wernle had provoked, very distinctly at the end, when the debate was languishing, and indeed, from the point of view of Wernle's contentions, when the battle was lost. It had much the appearance accordingly of a last vigorous attack, seeking to wring a victory out of defeat. And assuredly little was left unsaid by Windisch that could be said to rescue and save a lost cause.

What Windisch undertakes to do, to speak now of the formal contents of his volume, is to take up Wernle's proposition that to Paul Christians are in their actual nature sinless men, to justify it by a really thorough exegetical survey of the Pauline material, and then to place it in its histor-

¹ *Taufe und Sünde im ältesten Christentum bis auf Origines. Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Dogmengeschichte*, 1908. The book, published when he was twenty-seven years old, was Windisch's first book; at least it was preceded only by his Doctor's dissertation on *The Theodicy of Justin*, 1906.

ical connections both narrow and broad. For this purpose he traces the related conceptions with the same thoroughness through the rest of the New Testament books, and then extends the view backwards to Ezekiel and forward to Origen. He discovers preparations for the theory of the sinlessness of Christians, attributed to Paul, in the Prophets' demand for repentance, in the Jewish dogma of the sinless man of the end-time, and in the sacramental rite of cleansing baptism. He follows what he thinks of as survivals of the Pauline conception through the early Patristic writings, pausing at Origen only because he discovers in him the complete dissolution of the theory of Baptismal cleansing and the recognition of the natural necessity of sin, even for Christians. It is naturally, however, upon the New Testament text itself that he expends his chief effort, and he discusses this with a minuteness of detail, a fulness of exegetical comment, and a richness of illustrative remark which make the volume in effect a commentary on the entire New Testament from the point of view of its witness to the relation of the Christian life to sin. This detailed discussion of the New Testament text is of course the strength of the book; but, since its task is approached from a point of view really alien to the New Testament, it is also its weakness. Many concessions require to be made, many acts of exegetical violence are committed, much special pleading is indulged in, and it still remains necessary to declare the New Testament writers constantly inconsistent with themselves. Under whatever form it may be put forward, it is very clear that this is not really exposition. It rapidly becomes obvious to the reader that the New Testament passages which are discussed cannot be strung on the thread with which they are approached, and the most thorough of all attempts to show that to the New Testament writings the Christian is a sinless man becomes, by the very attempt to be thorough, its most thorough refutation. It becomes ever more and more plain that the text is intractable to this theory of its meaning.

We are not surprised, therefore, to observe that Wernle, reviewing the book under the spur of a wholesome sense of his own partial responsibility for its vagaries, throws into primary emphasis the notable lack of plain, human common sense which, despite all its diligence and acuteness, deforms its exegesis; and the general deficiency in it of a feeling for reality. "During the reading of great parts of the book," he says, "we live in the labyrinth of a bewitched world, while the simple reality of life lies without." In other words, Windisch has not shown us the plain three-dimensioned world which the New Testament reflects; he has attempted to work out a new two-dimensioned or four-dimensioned world, and to impose that on the New Testament writers as their own. Naturally everything in their world, under this treatment, takes on an artificial aspect. "What kind of a Paul is this that is depicted," cries Wernle,³—"a Paul for whom in the Epistles to the Corinthians the occurrence of sin in Christianity 'obviously' and 'again' 'makes theoretical difficulties,' who over against the same Corinthians 'artificially creates the problem of the sinful Christian,' who at I Cor. x. i ff 'deals plainly with the problem of sin after baptism,' who gives to his Galatians as sinful Christians an injunction to the sinless life, and sets before them the essence of the Christian as sinlessness, whose whole point of view was dominated by an ideal portrait of the Christian according to which the disappearance of sin characteristically accompanies becoming a Christian? I find this Paul, despite all the pre-Christian elucidations which Windisch adduces, a total psychological enigma; and not only he but all the primitive Christians in the mass must have been visionaries and dreamers if the author's closing result be right,—that Christians are in their real nature sinless men. No day perhaps passed for them in which intelligence of faults, failings, aberrations, did not smite their eyes or ears from near and far, and yet, for example, it was so difficult for the

² *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1909, 21, col. 589.

³ Coll. 587-8.

preacher of Second Clement, because of his rigoristic theory of baptism, to make a demand for repentance, that he must writhe about sadly before he can give to Christians the exhortation to penitence demanded by the actual state of things. And why so? Because first of all for all those Christians a theory of sinfulness was firmly established, and it was only with the presupposition of this theory that they could approach empirical reality."

In summing up at the end of his volume, the results of his investigations, Windisch formulates them crisply in the words which we have just seen Wernle quoting from him. They all are comprehended, he says,⁴ "in this, that he has established it as the doctrine of the primitive Church, that Christians are in their real nature sinless men." He then proceeds to develop a rationale of this doctrine, founded on the circumstance that Christianity is a historically grounded redemptive religion, in which the two matters of the first interest are the nature of the Redeemer and the nature of the redeemed. As the Redeemer is by nature without sin, so must His redeemed become sinless men. It is the burden of prophecy that all sin must be put away in order that the salvation of the Lord may come. It is the expectation which informs all apocalypses, that God will make His people sinless. Christianity comes as the fulfilment of prophecy and the realization of all the hopes founded on it, whether given expression in apocalypses or elsewhere. In it the longed for Messiah actually comes, and He brings with Him all that God's people had been taught to look for in Him; and that very especially in the special form of those expectations which sees just in sin the enemy He is to overcome. As the Messiah must be Himself without sin, so must He, in every sense of the word, save His people from their sins.

Of course all this is in substance true. But it does not follow that from this point of view Christians must be sinless; that, as Windisch expresses it, "sinless men have been

⁴ P. 507.

on the earth ever since the sinless Messiah was sent by God"—because "the fulfilment of the hope and the realization of the requirement in the circles of the Christians have their historical starting point in the person of the Messiah Jesus."⁵ The essence of the matter is contained in the simple remark that all that is here adduced leaves it still an open question how and when Christ's salvation of His people from their sins is to be supposed to reach its completion. He came into the world, let us say, to save sinners; to save them from their sins; from the guilt of their sins, from the pollution of them, from their power, from the commission of them,—from all that they are, and from all that they bring with them in the way of effects or consequences. But it does not follow that this whole body of results must be supposed—or will naturally be supposed—to be brought about at once—"on faith." There is death, for instance; that it is a consequence of sin (Rom. v. 12). There may have been some in Paul's churches who fancied that they were to be relieved from the necessity of dying (I Thess. iv. 13 ff). Paul does not encourage the notion. He points rather to the resurrection, and to the coming of Christ, events which were to take place in the future,—how far in the future he says he does not know, but quite obviously well in the future. It is impossible to imagine that this Paul, nevertheless, supposed that the whole process of salvation was instantaneously completed when the act of faith was exercised. Rather, he constantly refers its completion and that very especially in its ethical aspects, to this same coming of the Lord (I Thess. ii. 19, iii. 13, v. 23). It is that future event—perhaps far future event—then, which forms the term of the salvation of Christians; and as their salvation is precisely salvation from sin it is only at the arrival of that event that they realize to the full the "salvation from sin" which they receive from Christ Jesus.

This fundamental historical fact enables us to place our finger on Windisch's central error in his interpretation of

⁵ P. 509.

the New Testament writers with reference to the nature of the Christian life. He misses the significance of the inter-adventual period. Paul calls it "the day of salvation," which means not merely the day in which salvation is freely offered to men, but also, in the light of a passage like I Cor. xv. 25 f., the day during which the saving work is perfected in men and in the world. Windisch necessarily misses this constitutive fact in Paul's teaching because he ascribes to the New Testament writers, Paul included, an expectation of the coming of the Lord as immediately impending. That is not, however, their view. Paul, for example, teaches with great fervor and consistency a doctrine of a prolonged period of development under the government of the exalted Jesus, through which the world advances to a glorious consummation. It is in this period of world-development that he sees his Christians living. They form its core and leaven, and he of course attributes to them individually a similar development, reaching its completion in the same great consummation. Not when He was on earth merely, but now also while He is in heaven, according to Paul's view, Jesus is actively our Saviour. He is still while in heaven "saving His people from their sins;" and that not in the mass merely, but also with reference to the individual. His work of saving the individual therefore as truly as that of saving the world is given the character of a process; and the end of this process for the one as for the other is to be reached only at the parousia. That the sanctification of the Christian is a process, belongs thus to the very substance of Paul's doctrine of salvation, and his repeated allusions to it in his writings cannot be explained away.

It is not, however, on the progressive character of the Christian's salvation from sin, itself, that this new interpretation of Paul impinges with most deadly effect, but on—what is implicated in it—the continuous dependence of the progressively saved sinner on the living activities of the saving Christ. We are made to feel this very sharply when

Windisch comes to tell us how the teaching of the Reformation differs from that of his new Paul.⁶ The difference, as stated, turns, of course, on a difference in their views of the application of justification. According to Paul, we are told, we receive in justification forgiveness of our past sins only, while with Luther the forgiveness received in it is extended to all the sins we may commit through life. This mode of statement, however, only touches the surface of the matter. Underneath it lies a conception which throws the Christian back on his own resources and withdraws from him all recourse to, as it denies of him all need of, the continued saving activities of Christ our Mediator. The real dividing question comes, therefore, to be seen to be whether the Christian is always dependent on Christ and always looks to Him as His one complete Saviour. According to the new interpretation of Paul, Christ earns for us only the first grace; after that we must earn eternal life for ourselves by our own work and merit. This means of course that his own works are a Christian's sole dependence. It is only, we are told, those out of Christ who have no works on which to depend, and who therefore are exhorted not to depend on their own works. Paul, "in his rejection of our own works is thinking apparently only of the works of our earlier life;" while the Reformation expressly excludes present and future works also. All that we receive in Christ is thus for Paul exhausted in that "first grace"; after that we are left to our own resources. This is as much as to say that all that Christ has done for us is to start us on our way; we have to walk in the way for ourselves. We must not forget that, according to this new reading of Paul, he represents Christ as giving us a magnificent start. He not only in that "first grace" gives us forgiveness of sins but takes them away; so that all we have to do is to keep ourselves as He leaves us. It is not, to be sure, overly clear precisely what is meant by His taking away our sins; in the passage at present be-

⁶ Pp. 524 ff.

fore us, Windisch apparently assumes that it means the cleansing of our corrupt nature—which is also what from the logical point of view it should mean. At all events it is here that the difference between this new reading of Paul and the Reformation teaching comes to its head. Windisch fixes on a phrase in the *Formula Concordiae* to give it pointed expression. We are told there that “we are and remain sinners” because of our corrupted nature, and therefore depend entirely on Christ. “This ‘and remain sinners,’ ” says Windisch, “admirably indicates the application of the doctrine of justification which goes beyond Paul.” According to Paul, we do not “remain” sinners, and accordingly do not any longer need Christ. We have got all that Christ can give us; henceforth it is our own concern. Clearly we have two different religions contrasted here. We gain by the new interpretation of Paul a more immediate perfection in our lives. We lose by it Christ out of our lives.

It would be wrong not to pause to observe that this new interpretation of Paul is really a modernization of Paul, in the theological sense of that word. One may suspect that it has its real source largely in the imputation to Paul by its authors, in more or less fullness, of their own conceptions of what the Christian life actually is. It is at all events a great step towards the modernization of Paul to relieve him of all implication in the ascription of a present saving activity to Christ. Really “modern” men do not think, of course, of allowing to even the acts of the historical Jesus any expiatory character, any “forgiveness-procuring” value. But it is a wide step toward their mode of thinking to eliminate all activities of Christ except those of the historical Jesus. When it is said that Paul knows nothing of continued saving activities by Christ after His death—that what he did while on earth, serves, according to Paul, to bring about that repentance and faith which secures forgiveness and delivers from sin, and after that, it is our own concern—the exalted Christ is made as much “hidden” to Paul as it

is to Ritschl, and all communion with Him is as completely eliminated from Paul's thought as it is from Herrmann's. The resultant conception of the Christian life itself, therefore, attributed to Paul is also thoroughly "modern." Man is thrown back on his own ethical activities, which are made the decisive thing in his standing or falling. All that he really obtains from Christ is a new start; the slate is washed clean for him. No doubt it is in the inspiration of this new start that he goes forward. But in the end all depends on what he has himself written on the cleansed slate. Paul is in other words thought of as teaching a "moralistic" doctrine of salvation of quite modern aspect. He is made a very respectable follower of Ritschl—or something worse.

It is this understanding of the teaching of Paul, and with him of John,⁷ and indeed *mutatis mutandis*, of the whole New Testament, and of early Christianity in general, that Windisch sets before us at the end of his volume as the result of his investigations. It is questionable, however, whether the detailed report of these investigations, very richly set out in the volume itself, sustains this result. Windisch is himself very prompt to admit that we cannot speak with any propriety of it as the only Biblical doctrine. Indeed, from his point of view there is no such thing as "a Biblical doctrine"; many different notions concerning the Christian life may be found in the Bible. To give point to this assertion, he adds illustratively:⁸ "Yes, even 'miserable-sinnerism' is represented in the Bible. Jesus, for example, along with the Methodistic notion of repentance which he employs, along with His strict requirement of cleansing, recognises the continuance of sinning, and assures His disciples like any Lutheran Christian of the abiding favor of God." It may tend to console "miserable-sinner Christians" to know that it is admitted that Jesus is on their side. And this is not all. For Windisch is com-

⁷ Cf. p. 509: "Paul and John are the typical and irrefutable witnesses for the dogma that the Christian is freed from sin (*entsündigt*)."

⁸ P. 634.

pelled to admit also that Paul himself is not able to preserve unbrokenly an attitude towards Christians which sees in them those sinless men whom he is said to proclaim them. In point of fact, it is explained,⁹ the relations of Christians to sin are spoken of by Paul from three different points of view. "The *Messiah-man, cleansed by God*, is delivered from all sin and temptation. The *normal and ideal Christian* has separated himself from sin, is conscious of no new sin, and yet must, under the faithful guidance of God, be on his guard against sinful temptation. Finally the *unestablished, imperfect Christian* still occasionally commits sin, and even is still entangled in serious faults; he is still unconverted, has not yet yielded himself to the control of the Spirit, has lost the feeling of being with Christ and with His Spirit; if he is not to be destroyed he must at length repent and let the Spirit come into action, he must repent afresh and yield to Christ and to the Spirit." Needless to say the Apostle gives no hint of the existence of any such three classes of Christians. These are only three different ways in which, according to Windisch, Paul is found actually dealing from time to time with Christians. If so we can only say that he dealt with them very inconsistently,—implying sometimes that Christians are glorified saints, sinless and sin-proof; sometimes that they are indeed without sin but only through their own strenuous efforts and always liable to sin; and sometimes that they are sin-stained creatures who must bestir themselves lest they perish. Windisch, however, very remarkably as it seems to us, draws the conclusion from the situation thus depicted that Christians are, according to Paul sinless beings. "In every case," he says, "all—what has happened and what ought to happen—tends to this—that the Christian is a sinless man." "By this ideal," he now continues, "all the Apostle's expectations are permeated. Only in two passages (I Cor. iv. and v.) does Paul give expression to the view that God will pardon also the Christian who has remained a sinner; these, however

⁹ P. 219.

deal with disgraceful exceptions." He says two passages, apparently, only by a slip of the pen. There is nothing in the fourth chapter of First Corinthians to satisfy the allusion, and it is clear that his mind is on merely the opening verses of the fifth chapter. Therefore he continues: "In this single passage Paul gives expression to a conception which presents an individual Christian as a 'miserable sinner' who is not able to fulfil his life-task. We may add to this, no doubt, certain oft-recurring exhortations, which at least indirectly 'reckon with the sin of the Christian,'—exhortations to return no more evil for evil (I Thess. v. 15, Rom. xii. 17), to forgive one another as God has forgiven us (Col. iii. 13, Eph. iv. 32)." This is a most inadequate adduction of the relevant material; but even so, it is enough to show that Paul does not prevailingly deal with Christians as if they were sinless, but assumes on the contrary that sin ever lies at their door. Windisch, however, comments as follows: "Our expositions have shown that in none of these declarations can the proposition find support for itself that Paul sees in sin the constant attendant of the Christian." It is doubtless true that exhortations not to sin imply immediately only a constant liability to sin, not a constant sinning. The distinction is, however, a rather narrow one; and one wonders whether a constant liability to sin which was never illustrated by actual sinning would naturally call out such constant exhortations against sinning.

And one wonders also whether Windisch wishes to convey the impression that in his exhortations to growth in the Christian life Paul invariably confines himself to the positive side of this growth, or the putting on of graces, and never exhorts Christians to the negative aspect of it, or the putting off of vices—always in other words, urges the putting on of the new man, never the putting off of the old man. Obviously the implication of exhortations to put away vices may be not merely that we are liable to these vices, but that we are afflicted with them. Paul's Epistles fairly

swarm with such exhortations. The fact is too patent to require illustration, and it is not denied by Windisch. He founds on it indeed his representation that Paul has two inconsistent theories of cleansing from sin, the mystic and the paranetic; and in expounding this representation he actually allows that the paranetic theory implies the continuance of sinfulness in Christians.¹⁰ "The paranesis of conversion," he says, "goes back to the phrases, 'that ye may walk in newness of life,' and 'that ye may no longer serve sin'; only, according to its intrinsic peculiarity, it presupposes subsistent sinfulness or temptability"; it is only this second theory, he says again, "which reckons with the temptability of the Christian, and in it there is even to be assumed as we have seen, an actual sin of the Christian." This admission falls short, no doubt, of allowing that Paul presupposes "continual sinning" in Christians, although that too is the real implication of Paul's continual paranesis. It must be allowed also that in dealing with the several paranetic passages Windisch does his best to transform the imperatives into indicatives. It is in its failure to enter into what may be called the prevailing paranetic tone of Paul's epistles, indeed, that Wernle finds the fundamental fault of Windisch's book. It would be truer to the real state of the case, he intimates,¹¹ if instead of turning the imperatives into indicatives, the indicatives were read as nothing but strengthened imperatives. "The inability to sin in Rom. vi.," he adds illustratively, "is the strongest imperative which Paul has at his disposal, and very properly passes therefore in the end into the *impropriety* of sinning. . . . In I Cor. vi. 11, Gal. v. 25, this imperative in the form of retrospect is very evident." The idea meant to be conveyed is that Paul always writes with moral impression in view and has as his end the ethical advancement of his readers. Even his indicative statements have this as their end, and to that extent have an imperative concealed in their affirmations.

¹⁰ Pp. 180-182.

¹¹ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1909, 21, col. 588.

The fundamental paranesis which Windisch has to face in his endeavor to turn the exhortations rather into declarations, is of course that of the sixth chapter of Romans. He opens his exposition of this passage¹² with the remark that Paul repels the suggestion that Christians are to continue in sin—and that is the same as asserting that they are no longer to sin—and supports it by declaring that sin has become an impossibility to the pardoned man. This representation can be allowed only provided that the "impossibility" asserted be understood as a logical one. That is to say, what Paul asserts is that it is grossly inconsistent for the converted man to sin; he ought not to sin with an oughtness which should be compulsory for his whole conduct. If, however, it were a sheer impossibility in the strict sense of that word for Christians to sin Paul should have spared himself his useless argument. That he has not thus spared himself proves that sinning was not only not impossible for the converted man, but was not unexampled among converted men, or even unusual. Paul is laboring here to deter his readers from sinning; and that is the way we deal with men who still sin, not with those who have ceased sinning altogether. Windisch allows that the life, the new life, is presented in some sense as a task; but he insists with reference to the newness of life itself, that it is a sheer gift, and that the power that it brings is not an "ought" but a "can." This is of course so far true: but the point at issue is not the newness of life itself but the walk in this newness of life; and that is, as he is himself ready to allow, a task. He dismisses the idea, it is true, that this task includes the overcoming of hindrances; there is no conflict, no effort, no advance in the walk to which Christians are exhorted. "As little as in the case of Christ is the new walk conceived as a conflict or advance." "It is a walk on an open and level road." What is true in such statements is only that these things are not expressly notified in the words themselves, but are left to the general implica-

¹² Pp. 167ff.

tion. But they are very expressly included in the general implication. The future tenses, as it is natural they should, greatly disturb Windisch. But his troubles come to their climax only when he reaches the "believe" of verse 8 and the "reckon" of verse 11. "The determination of the sense of the 'reckon,'" he says,¹³ "is not easy and not certain." "I might say," he adds, "that it is the subjective conception of an objective fact, arising from the 'apprehension' of Christ and of mystical connection with Him. To gather from it an element of pure subjectivity and of uncertainty of the objective, seems to me illegitimate. Paul would no doubt have applied 'reckon' to the possibility of mysteriously worked circumstances." Very possibly. But he could not easily apply it to objective conditions directly known in an experience already in full enjoyment. The thing that cannot be balked is that Paul's readers had to *consider* themselves dead to sin and living to God. It was *not* to them a matter of complete present enjoyment but of faith. And then, at this point of the discussion, Windisch has to brace himself to meet as best he may the full force of the paranesis.

The memory of his struggle with the sixth chapter of Romans, Windisch carries over with him to Col. iii. 5, another paranesis which gives him some trouble. Paul is dealing in the opening verses of this chapter, he tells us, with the positive side of the Christians' transformation. They have been raised with Christ; and, having been raised, says Paul, their life is now hidden with Christ in God. "The glorified nature," Windisch explains, "is already present but invisible, hidden still in God's protection. It is only the revelation, not the new-creation of the 'life' that still holds back." The influence of the Jewish hopes of cleansing and glorification on Paul's thought, Windisch suggests, is visible here. "Like the apocalyptist Baruch, Paul sees cleansing and glorification together as one process." He certainly sees them together,—and one result

¹³ P. 174.

of that is that he postpones the accomplishment of the one as of the other to the manifestation of Christ our life; in the meantime it is true of both these things that they are "not yet manifest." This means naturally that as we are not free from weakness in this transition period, so we are not free from sin. Windisch, however, says: "A reference to the sinful *habitus* of the Christian is altogether lacking;" it is only asceticism that is in question, and that is spoken of with contempt. Why, however, we need to ask, does Paul throw such contempt on this asceticism? Precisely because it is useless for the purposes of moral cleansing! These practices, says he (ii. 23) "are not of any value against the indulgence of the flesh." That is the reason why he pronounces them useless to his Christians. What he conceives Christians to be in need of, therefore, is something that will aid them in their battle against "the indulgence of the flesh." Is not that to relate the matter to "the sinful *habitus*"? And is it not to say that the Christian life on earth is a process of conquering sin in its manifestations in that life—"the *indulgence* of the flesh"? Positively, no doubt, this process may find expression in seeking the things that are above, in contrast with the things of earth (iii. 1, 2). But it has a negative side too. Precisely because we have died with Christ and our life is hidden with Him in God, to be manifested in all its fulness in due season, we must bestir ourselves in the meanwhile to be prepared for its revelation. "Mortify therefore your members which are on the earth," says the Apostle (iii. 5 ff.). "Therefore!" That is a very significant "therefore," and one very unaccountable to Windisch. "The very first word 'mortify,'" he says, "shows clearly that a completely new train of thought is begun." But Paul says "therefore." "What we have to inquire," Windisch says, "is whether possibly there is not attempted here a connection between heterogeneous conceptions." But Paul says "therefore"; and "therefore" does not connect "heterogeneous conceptions." Well, says Windisch,¹⁴ it is at

¹⁴ P. 200.

least not a *process* of cleansing which is intimated here: look at the aorists—"mortify," "put away," verses 5, 8. It is an abrupt passage from sin to holiness which the apostle has in mind. But neither will this plea serve him. The "aorist of the strong imperative" is too familiar a usage to be overlooked.¹⁵ Of course Paul wished decisive acts of moral amendment from his Christians, and that is the reason he uses these strong aorists. But there is no implication that the end in view could be accomplished at once. And the main point is that such an exhortation was not superfluous for Christians. Windisch seeks to meet this, desperately we should suppose, by suggesting that Paul was so accustomed to the use of a catechism for neophytes that he writes down mechanically from it these exhortations, though, of course, he had no knowledge of his readers being guilty of any such sins. In other words, his exhortations here are purely conventional. If so, we need to ask why it was that he was led to transcribe just such and such sections of the catechism for neophytes when writing to Christians. Must we not suppose that he used the sections of the catechism which in general were suitable to the case in hand? We do not seem by this road to escape the implication that precisely these exhortations were appropriate for Christians as Christians.

A similar means of escape to that which he makes use of here Windisch essays again, when commenting on Rom. xiii. 1 where Paul requires Christians to be good citizens and warns them that rulers are of divine appointment and we must subject ourselves to them for conscience's sake and not merely from fear of punishment. It certainly seems to be implied here that it was conceivable that Christians, if

¹⁵ Cf. Winer's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Thayer's translation, p. 314. In John xiv. 15, *Keep* my commandments does not mean keep them once for all; neither does, John xv. 4, *Abide* in me, refer to a single act; nor, I John v. 21, *Keep* yourselves from idols, refer to a single separation of ourselves from idols; nor, Mark xvi. 15, *Go and preach*, refer to the delivery of a single sermon. The verb in every petition of the Lord's Prayer is an aorist, the suitable tense, as Gildersleeve says, for "instant prayer."

they did not take heed to themselves, might transgress the law of the state and in doing so sin against God. This appearance Windisch does not deny. "Here," says he,¹⁶ "the Apostle seems clearly to say that now and again sin may bring even Christians into conflict with the state." "But," he adds, "this is not so. It is not Paul the counselor of the community of believers in the Messiah who is speaking here, but the Hellenistic instructor of mankind. The Thou is man not the Christian. The possibility that a 'Christian' should need to be punished by the state for an offence, he did not seriously entertain; he did not intend to apply the civil law to the sin of the 'Christian.' What he wishes to make obvious to the Roman Christians is the humanitarian conception of the state, in and of itself. They are to observe in the ordinances of the state the same divine discipline to which they have subjected themselves." As Paul here forgot he was a Christian leader addressing Christians and spoke as a heathen philosopher preaching good citizenship, so, only a few verses further on he forgets himself again and speaks to his Christian readers in the forms in which he was accustomed to address his heathen audiences in his missionary preaching. The passage is Rom. xiii. 11-14, and Windisch finds it impossible to deny that Paul speaks in it to his readers as if they were still living in sin.¹⁷ He speaks to them, he says, as if they were still unconverted people. He exhorts them in terms—"make not provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof"—which imply that they were still capable of sinning, or, rather we should say, were still constantly sinning: "*continue not* to make provision for the flesh to fulfill the lusts thereof." The Christians are simply required to put away their vices, and the vices that are enumerated are real vices. This, precisely on the ground that they are Christians, that they had long been Christians, and that it was high time for them "to show up better" as Christians. This certainly does not look as if

¹⁶ P. 190.

¹⁷ Pp. 191-2.

Christians were to Paul as such sinless men. No, as Windisch complains, he treats them as if they had always up to the moment of his addressing them, lived like heathen. But Windisch grasps at the straw, that he requires of them an immediate and final break with their old sin: "Not a realizing now to be begun and gradually to be accomplished is required, but an immediate passage from sin to sinlessness." Even that straw, however, does not sustain him. He is at his wits' end. "The words," says he, "strike on us as very surprising. That a totally changed conception of the Christian state lies here, is felt by everybody. We have found the ideal carriage of the community strongly emphasized, never actual sin, but only the possibility of sin, brought into consideration, a process of renewal already brought in substantiated. Now the Christians are suddenly required to discontinue their vicious life, and yet such vices are alluded to as could confidently be supposed to have been overcome. How is this change in conception to be explained?" Windisch sees but one way. Paul was a missionary, and had acquired certain modes of speech in his missionary addresses. And here, as he was writing to the Roman Christians—"the spirit of the missionary came over him, and instead of the Christians who needed only further helpful instruction, he sees a body of lost sinners before him whom he now has to snatch with one grasp out of their sinfulness."

There is another characteristic of the passage which gives Windisch some trouble. That is the interchange of the first and second persons in it. Windisch is unwilling to allow any significance to this interchange. "Because it is the missionary that is speaking," he says,^{17a} "I do not think that the 'we' is to be referred to his self-consciousness. It is a pure style-form. It gives place at once to 'you.' Since he abandons the first person precisely with 'put ye on,' it is clear that he cannot have included himself in the 'we'." For support in this somewhat remarkable opinion

^{17a} P. 192

he apparently appeals to A. Jülicher's comment on the passage. At least, to the sentence which expresses his opinion that the "we" is not to be referred to Paul's self-consciousness, he appends a note which says, "compare Jülicher," with a reference to Jülicher's comment. We do not find anything in that comment, however, which can lend support to Windisch's representation.¹⁸ What we find, on the contrary, is a remark to the effect that Paul does include himself in the exhortations of verses 12b and 13, and that that fact precludes our using verses 11, 14 to prove that there was no trace of spiritual life in the Roman church at all. This would be in any case an overstrained use of these verses; but the fact that Paul includes himself in verses 12b and 13 and does not in 11, 14, does at least show that he did not feel it possible to associate himself with the Roman Christians in what he has to say of them in verses 11 and 14, or at least in verse 14—for the "you" in verse 11 may be only the direct address appropriate to the opening of the exhortation. The strength of the language employed is, no doubt, throughout, as Jülicher suggests, due to a desire to move the consciences of the Roman Christians strongly. The particular items in the enumeration of vices in verse 13 are chosen accordingly to meet their case, actual or possible. In

¹⁸ Jülicher's Commentary on Romans is published in J. Weiss' *Schriften des Neuen Testaments*. The section on Rom. xiii. 11-14 is identically the same in the first and second editions (1907, 1908.) The failure of Jülicher to support Windisch at this point is the more significant because they occupy common ground in the contention that Paul holds that Christians are sinless. Commenting on Rom. iv. 15, for example, Jülicher represents Paul as meaning that "where the law is not—in the blessed present (iii. 21, 26)—there is also no transgression and accordingly no excitation of the divine wrath." And then he adds: "An extremely characteristic declaration of the ideal glory in which Paul saw the condition of humanity—no more punishment because no sin." E. Kühl (*in loco*) very sharply, from his own point of view, corrects Jülicher for this certainly very unjustified exposition and inference. It is probably enough to say that the meaning of the declaration that "where law is not there is no transgression either"—which is no doubt a general proposition—is *here* that the promised inheritance was in no sense conditioned on law; it was a promise of pure grace and rested on the righteousness of faith.

associating himself with his readers in these middle clauses of the passage the Apostle—the more forcibly that it is purely without calculation—intimates that it is not true of bad Christians alone, but it is a universal Christian characteristic, that they must be constantly turning away from sin and reaching upwards. As Jülicher puts it: “that the awakening from sleep and the putting on of Christ must be daily repeated, with ever greater result, was to him no mystery.” It is impossible therefore to escape from the implications of the passage that Christians are not sinless but sinful men, in process of making their way through the night to that day which is presented as the goal of their endeavor.

A similar instance of Paul's associating himself with his readers in an exhortation to moral improvement is found in 2 Cor. i. 7: “Let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.” Windisch deals with this passage very much as he deals with Rom. xiii. 11 ff.¹⁹ It is clearly a piece of missionary preaching which Paul more or less inadvertently delivers to his Christians. He is not thinking of any “gradual amendment,” but is calling on sinful Christians to lay aside once for all, in one comprehensive act, all sin, and “to let the ideal of a truly holy walk become reality in their empirical life.” It is only misplaced exegetical ingenuity which would “infer from the use of the first person that the Apostle includes himself in the exhortation.” “The ‘we’ is a friendly style form.” Meanwhile, it remains inexplicable that if Christians are as such sinless men Paul could address these Christians in this fashion. The Christians whom he addresses he distinguishes at length and in the most pungent way, in the immediately preceding context, from the heathen; and exhorts them to hold themselves aloof from heathen modes of thinking and standards of conduct. He cannot possibly be reverting here to a “missionary” mode of speech more suitable to heathen than to

¹⁹ P. 150.

Christians. There is no reason whatever for representing the cleansing to which Paul exhorts here as a thing which is expected to be, or that can be, accomplished suddenly, in a single stroke. The employment of “the strong aorist”—“let us cleanse ourselves”—only shows that the Apostle is exhorting his readers to undertake the task he is urging them to at once, vigorously and with decisive effect; while the present participle which follows it—“while we are bringing holiness to perfection”—shows that the task is accomplished only through a process,—is, as H. A. W. Meyer expresses it, “the continual moral endeavour and work of the Christian, purifying himself.” And finally it is beyond question that the Apostle includes himself in what thus is marked out as the common task of all Christians. No one forms an exception, at any stage of his Christian life, to the need of purifying himself from defilement of one sort or another, affecting the flesh or the spirit, and so continuing the perfecting of his holiness in the fear of God. And therefore, when exhorting the Corinthians to this activity of, not keeping ourselves pure, but of making ourselves pure, the Apostle, as Meyer puts it, with true moral feeling of the universality of this need, places himself, the mature Christian, on an equality with them, the immature. The Christian life is conceived here as a continuous process of active advancement in, negatively, purification and, positively, sanctification.

A very striking passage of the same general order meets us in I Cor. xi. 17 ff. In the midst of Paul’s rebuke of the Corinthians for irreverent conduct in connection with the Lord’s Supper, two verses (vs. 31, 32) suddenly occur in which the second person gives way to the first: “But if we discerned ourselves we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we may not be condemned with the world.” The effect of this change of persons is, of course, to give the assertion contained in these verses a greater generality. “You,” “you,” “you,” the Apostle had been saying, and after these verses

returns to saying: here he says "we"—not setting the two pronouns in contrast with one another (which would require that they be expressed) but broadening the one into the other. But why should he broaden his statement in just these two verses? H. A. W. Meyer (and Heinrici after him) says: "The use of the first person gives to the sentence the gentler form of a general statement, not referring merely to the state of things at Corinth, but of universal application." That is true of course; but it does not fully answer the question. There is no obvious reason why just this remark should be singled out for gentler statement. It is not intrinsically the severest remark in the context, which therefore called particularly for softening. The plain fact is that, in his rebuke to the Corinthians, the Apostle introduces this general mode of speech here because what he has to say here no longer applies to the Corinthians only, but is true of all Christians, himself included. Only the Corinthians had been guilty of the specific faults mentioned in the surrounding context. But all Christians are sinners; they all require to "discern themselves"; they all fail, more or less, in that wholesome duty; thus failing, they are all chastened by the Lord, in order that they may escape condemnation for their sins. This is the picture which Paul draws for us here of the Christian life. A. Titius is quite right, then, when he says,^{19a} that Paul "in I Cor. xi. 31 f. expressly reckons himself in the number of those who are judged and disciplined by the Lord, because they have foreborne their own proving—" although he is at once contradicted by C. Clemen²⁰ and subsequently by Windisch.²¹ Windisch does not say here, however, as in former cases which we have noted, that Paul's "we" is simply a trick of style and means nothing. He endeavors to discover how Paul may be supposed to associate himself with the Corinthians, without the implication that he too needed to be brought to give proper attention to his sinning by

^{19a} As cited, II. p. 83.

²⁰ As cited, *Paulus*, II. p. 102.

²¹ P. 139.

chastening from the Lord. The theory which he broaches is in brief this—sufferings were sent to others to bring them to a recognition of their sins and to separation of themselves from them; they were sent to Paul, to suppress temptation to sin in him. In associating himself with the Corinthians by his "we," "Paul therefore did not intend to recognize that he too was punished by God because of his sins; he has nevertheless used a 'we,' because he too in another sense reckoned himself among the 'disciplined.'" This is rather a weird theory—which has no ground in the text, and indeed has nothing to recommend it except that it avoids recognizing that Paul confesses himself a sinner, who is dealt with by God as a sinner. It labors meanwhile under the disadvantage that in its effort to relieve Paul from the sins which he confesses, it involves him in a sin which he does not confess; and indeed scarcely avoids involving God Himself in sin. For it is not a sin to profess to be at one with others in a matter in which you are really radically different from them? And is it not a sin to inflict punishment where punishment is in no way deserved?

It is quite clear that Paul conceives of Christians as not yet freed from sinning. Windisch struggles hard not to admit it, although of course he struggles in vain. How hard he struggles may be revealed to us by his comment on I Cor. xii. 21.²² There is probably no passage in the New Testament which throws into a more lurid light the sins of which Christians may possibly be guilty. Paul, speaking to his readers with affection and addressing them as "beloved," expresses a fear lest, when he comes to them, he may find the evils which he has rebuked among them still existing, and many of the sinners whom he has reproved still unrepentant. He describes those whom he has in mind as "those who have formerly sinned," meaning those whose sinning had fallen under his rebuke on a previous occasion,—as it seems without effect. Windisch²³ adopts the notion, however, that by "those who have formerly sinned" Paul

²² P. 151.

²³ P. 151.

means those who have sinned before their conversion (as if Paul could have imagined that there were any who had *not* sinned before their conversion) and seizes upon the words to ground a representation that Paul means to say that these sinning Christians were not Christians at all. "I may paraphrase the words," he says, "thus—they continue their heathenish sins steadily, and have not even yet repented." Paul, it seems, "looked upon such Christians as have still after baptism committed whether serious or lighter sins, as if they had not yet been converted at all: sinning Christians are to him unconverted people." The fact that they sin proves that they have not yet been converted—because Christians do not sin. It is part of Windisch's theory, however, to emphasize the "not yet." They are not quite the same as heathen after all: they have been baptized, and by their baptism they have both been made capable of repentance and been obligated to repent. But they have not done so; and until they have done so, they are not Christians; and that is the reason they can still sin. That is the theory, he says, that Paul went upon. But experience compelled Paul to modify it. It was only too plain that Christians did sin. He could not think otherwise, however, than that if a real Christian sinned he would be hopelessly lost: there remained no place of repentance for him. And so Paul, out of the gentleness of his heart, represents the Christians who sin as not yet having completed the process of becoming Christians by repentance, and so as still capable of salvation. This reasoning is so incredible that we transcribe the very words in which it is presented:—"The 'not yet' however is to be emphasized. It is precisely because of it that baptized people also are *able* to repent. When Paul describes sin as a Christian's sin, it sounds as if he gave the sinner up for lost: the fornicator severs himself from Christ. If he intends to maintain the salvation of the sinning Christian, he changes his point of view; then the Christian has not yet entered into relation with Christ. Radically framed conceptions

dominate his thought; but because within the limits of these radically framed forms a change of point of view is possible, he is able to do justice to reality. There is nothing problematical to him about the repentance of one long baptized.” This certainly is beautifully simple. Paul describes Christians as sinning and repenting. Windisch says that in Paul’s view Christians do not sin, or if they manage to sin, cannot repent. Hence, says he, when Paul speaks of a Christian sinning, and calls on him to repent, he really means he is no Christian. And thus, he says, Paul keeps in touch with reality. We observe meanwhile simply in passing that it is precisely the “spiritual” Christians whom in Gal. vi. 1 Paul speaks of as liable to fall into sin; and perhaps we may be allowed to add that in I Tim. v. 30 not only Christians as such but even the elders among Christians are contemplated as able to sin.

It is only Paul, not Windisch, who is deceived by this mental legerdemain. And thus, as we have already seen, Windisch is compelled, after all is said, to pronounce Paul self-contradictory in his modes of thinking of Christians in their relation to sin. He does not pretend to think this contradiction a merely surface one. “Paul,” he tells us,²⁴ “following different influences arising from experience and observation, brings together really incompatible things. From the mysteriously wrought cleansing, from the mystical life with Christ, which has made men insusceptible and apathetic to the allurements of sin, there exists no passable road for logical and psychological thinking to the obligation to refuse obedience to sinful lusts. No doubt even the theory of cleansing and renewal permits an outlook on the further life of man. But the way in which the walk of the cleansed person is described shows that no subsequent conversion can be added. The new walk is not given the task to overcome old oppositions; the new man has only to tread the road which God has opened for him and in which God leads him. Thus Paul, in Romans, sets the theory of bap-

²⁴ P. 217.

tism and the requirements of conversion immediately together, and when he, in the later letters, unites them, an insoluble contradiction arises, because he is trying to think incongruities together." And yet he suggests that Paul's entertainment of two such contradictory conceptions together is psychologically explicable from the circumstance that in the rite of baptism a place was found for exhortation to the neophyte to carry out in life his character as a baptized person. "This element of human activity suggested by the theory of baptism may offer a certain mediation between the two disparate modes of conception. It means that the instruction and exhortation may be tendered also to the cleansed man. Presenting himself to empirical man, Paul falls involuntarily into the tone of the preacher of repentance." Windisch does not remark on the equal inconsistency of the conjunction of the two conceptions in question in the baptismal ritual or even on the extreme inadvertence of Paul in forming his fundamental teachings.

In another passage²⁵ he discusses somewhat more seriously the possibility of conciliating the two theories—the mystic and the paranetic, as he calls them. The prevailing exegesis, he points out, maintains their organic unity. The God-wrought change is spoken of as a transference of the life-center, or, more frequently and more weakeningly, as a change in principle. And there is attached to it the task which is set for man. This is actually to realize in the empirical being, gradually pushing on to the outermost periphery, what God has effected in principle and in the center; or actually and really to become what we already are in principle. This conception, now, Windisch pronounces not un-Pauline if only the notion that the empirical cleansing proceeds gradually be eliminated. It becomes in this form in fact, he says, one of the theories of cleansing which he has himself brought to view as Paul's, consisting in an organic combination of the doctrine of justification and

²⁵ Pp. 180-182.

the requirement of conversion: "faith signifies an inner transformation of the spirit of man, which capacitates and impels him to put away sin by a radical break in his empirical life too." On the other hand, he continues, the mystical theory of cleansing can find no place in this mode of conceiving things. In it, deliverance from sin and the establishment of life appear as embraced in one particular definitive total process—that is to say, as effected in their completeness all at once. "The notions of dying and death are characteristic of this conception: they designate for the Christian experiences of the past and declare the impossibility of sinning in his new nature." The rejection here of the current understanding of the entire body of Paul's teaching as to the application of salvation, as forming an organic unity, declaring a salvation with the creative activity of God at its basis and human activities working out into manifestation what God works at the center, is, it will be observed, solely in the interest of the theory that what Windisch calls the mystical conception involves the complete transformation of human nature instantaneously. That is, however, by no means the case. Paul's insistence on the radicalness of the change wrought by God's saving power in sinners, by no means carries with it the implication that the whole change is completed in the twinkling of an eye. On the contrary the implication is always that it consumes time in its completion and engages in its processes the activities of men. It turns out that Windisch is not altogether unwilling to allow this. At the end of the paragraph he says that after all a certain conjunction between the two theories is possible, a line of connection may be laid down. And this line of connection proves to be precisely this: that "the mystical theory of cleansing too can speak of an activity of the man, of the man awakened to new life." "Only," he adds, reaching now the center of his contention, "this activity is exempted from the task of overcoming sin." Apparently then the concession amounts only to this: that in recreating man God does not destroy

him; he is still living and acting; but living and acting now as a sinless man, whereas before he lived and acted as a sinful man. He has no battle to fight, no struggle to undergo; as we are elsewhere told, the path opened up before him is a straight and smooth one.

That Paul does not so represent the Christian life, Windisch knows just as well as anybody. That is precisely the inconsistency of Paul which he is at the moment engaged in asserting. For side by side with the mystical theory of cleansing stands Paul's paranetic theory, and this presupposes "the continuous sinfulness or temptability" of Christians. "Thus there are two mutually exclusive theories which Paul opposes to the misuse of his gospel of grace; the one explains that the Christian by God's power has obtained a sinless nature,—the other that through the reception of grace he is obligated and capacitated to a sinless walk. Paul sums up what he has to say as to the relations of the Christians to sin thus—they are broken off through God's power or through the energy of the man's conversion. The first mode of conception describes the Christian throughout as a man suffused with heavenly powers, detached from the natural conditions of life. Only the second theory reckons with the temptability of the Christian; in it, as we have seen, even actual sin is assumed in the Christian."²⁶ In this contradiction he is forced to leave Paul. He does indeed add, most unexpectedly: "Our statements would require a decisive correction, if the exposition of the seventh chapter of Romans—no longer it is true the prevailing one—which finds set forth in the conflicts portrayed in it experiences of the renewed Paul, of the renewed ego, had to be recognized as right. Then it would be convincingly proved that the apostle 'is even inherently sinful,' yes, that he recognizes himself as a 'poor, miserable sinner.'" It is not in the seventh chapter of Romans alone, however, as we have already had occasion abundantly to observe, that Paul recognizes himself as well

²⁶ P. 181.

as all other Christians as sinful. Windisch has been telling us indeed that one of the two theories of cleansing which Paul employs in his teaching on the subject implies not only the temptability but the continued sinning of Christians. If however the matter is to be hung on the seventh chapter of Romans we are content: it seems to us quite certain that we have in these pungent verses a revelation of the inner life of the Christian striving against sin.²⁷

We certainly are conscious of no revulsion when Windisch lays stress on the greatness of the change which Paul felt himself to have experienced when he became a Christian. Neither is the language in which he describes it in itself altogether intolerable.²⁸ We can put a benevolent sense on such phrases as that Paul was "filled with Messianic enthusiasm," or even that he conceived himself "already a man of the Messianic era, transformed by the Messiah by means of a personal revelation, a new creature, with his selfish body dead, his sinful-lusting flesh suppressed, his sin removed." "Christ is here, the new age has come, the man of the new age is here"—that not unfairly expresses Paul's conviction. He did suppose that a supernaturally wrought transformation had taken place in him, and in all Christians. And this transformation was expressed in his life by (among other things) a sense of cleansing, purification. He, his Christians, were no longer of the earth earthy; their citizenship was in heaven; and they were sharers in the heavenly character,—which is without sin. We cannot emphasize too strongly this experience. It is the strength of Windisch's presentation that he emphasizes it—although he emphasizes it as an "experience" rather than a fact. He tells us what Paul thought of himself in his "enthusiasm," rather than what

²⁷ Windisch cites for this interpretation M. R. Engel, *Der Kampf um Römer 7*, 1902, to which he adds F. Mülau and L. Ihmels. This does not, however, exhaust the important names even in the "miserable-sinner" controversy. Add Max Meyer, E. Cremer, J. Hausleiter, Paul Feine, and even C. Clemen, O. Pfeiderer, A. Deissmann. Junker leaves the matter undecided.

²⁸ Pp. 220ff.

Christ had done for Paul in His almighty grace. That is the weakness of his presentation, and beyond that this further weakness—which perhaps is, in part at least, a result of the former—that he allows no time for the accomplishment of the great change, no process for its perfecting, no beginning and middle and end to it; but insists that because it means a radical breach with sin, therefore from its very inception no trace of sin can be admitted to exist. As a result he is compelled to admit that this high conception could not be sustained by Paul; that contact with life brought him disillusionment, or we must rather say, failure—for it was a matter which concerned not abstract opinion with him but a self-judgment which in the face of experience he could not maintain. Immediately after describing in glowing language how Paul in his enthusiasm felt himself without sin, Windisch is forced to add:²⁹ “It is true that, cast into the old course of things, he was not able to maintain literally his enthusiastic conception. He had to say of himself, that sin in him was not slain but put to flight. He could represent his life to his enemies and to those whom he wished to win for Christ as a blameless walk according to God’s working. But to his friends he revealed the secret that the maintenance of it on its high plane cost him uninterrupted struggle.” Is not this a little seventh chapter of Romans of Windisch’s own? Surely this is not the Paul who knows himself a man of the new age with his selfish body dead, his sin-tempting flesh suppressed, his sin taken away. But Windisch still has some fragments to save. The sin in him is not dead as he fondly thought; he needs steadily to fight it to keep it down—(that is the seventh chapter of Romans): but he keeps it down. “But that he has failed, that he fails and sins, incidentally and daily, he has never conceded.” He had, says Windisch, plenty of occasions to confess his sins if he had any to confess; and other teachers,—Philo, James, Clement, Clement of Alexandria, Origen—confess that

²⁹ P. 222.

they are "miserable sinners." Why not Paul? It might be enough to answer that Paul was not writing a confession but letters,—letters dealing not with his own conduct but that of his readers; and that he constantly includes himself with them when speaking of their liability to sin. It may be better to say simply, There is the seventh chapter of Romans—and Windisch's own little seventh chapter of Romans which we have just had occasion to observe. It seems to be very much a matter of standard. Probably no one thinks Paul was a "common sinner," or supposes that he means to represent all Christians as "common sinners." But if "sin is not dead in him," then he was still a sinner; and sin, being alive in him, affected all his activities, none of which was what it would have been had there been no sin in him,—and so he was not only "an incidental and daily sinner" but a perpetual sinner; and we are not surprised to hear on his lips the "miserable sinner's" cry—O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?

According to Paul, says Windisch,^{29a} Christianity rests on two foundation-stones: "justified by faith, and led by the Spirit; or without guilt because believing, and without sin because pneumatic." His purpose is to emphasize the latter of the two, because, in his view, the Reformation has thrust it aside and elevated justification into a position of such dominance that it may be thought of as the whole of Christianity.³⁰ And in emphasizing the latter of the two he wishes it to be taken strictly as he has expressed it, and justice to be done to its coordination with justification. Christianity consists in these two things, not in one without the other. At an earlier point³¹ he had, therefore, very properly repelled an idea advanced by Wernle and Munzinger to the effect that Paul's missionary preaching was of a purely religious character and took no account of ethics. We may learn the contrary, he says, even from his use of

^{29a} P. 158.

³⁰ Pp. 524, 529, 531.

³¹ P. 101.

the single word "sanctification." For "'sanctification' is the process by which the sinful man becomes a pure personal being, perfect according to the divine model,"—citing I Thess. iv. 7, 2 Thess. ii. 13 in illustration. Men, he continues, having received in faith the salvation to which God called them, were "by a divine act at the same time separated from the impurity which had formed their nature hitherto; there was given to them in the Holy Spirit the power to pursue a holy life removed from all immorality." "This moral transformation," he now goes on to say, "is accordingly conceived as an act of God and as a task which is appointed to the believer, as the total task of his life." This statement, which is not far from Paul's actual teaching as to the Christian's sanctification, and which seems quite simple in itself, Windisch finds to contain a whole nest of antinomies. These he undertakes to "explain," not in the sense of resolving them, but of seeking an origin for each separately in Paul's inheritance—as if Paul's mind was a mere receptacle into which things were dropped to remain related to one another only by mechanical contiguity. The main matter on which we wish to lay stress now, however, is the strength of the assertion that Christianity consists no less in sanctification than in justification—a statement quite true in itself—and the use to which it is put in order to discredit the Reformation doctrine of justification.

In the section in which the teaching of Paul as a whole is summed up, his doctrine of justification is presented in the first instance in its relation to the sins of Christians.³² "The doctrine of the gracious justification of the sinful man,"—the discussion begins in purely general terms, but with Paul in view—"seems to push aside the question of the sin of the Christian as a matter of course, as raising no problem. The sinful man stands here on earth exposed on account of his sin to condemnation in the rapidly approaching judgment, but over against him stands the

³² Pp. 213 f.

gracious God who does not impute to him his enormous guilt. This judgment is assured and sealed to him. Past and present are taken together; the view goes into the future which will bring salvation and glory because God forgives sin. In principle there lies at the bottom of this doctrinal conception the idea that the sin of the Christian will be forgiven as a matter of course." Then the discussion turns pointedly to Paul: "Paul also has so formulated it that the sinning Christian could draw from it daily comfort and assurance; we have forgiveness in Christ and stand under grace; Christ appears for us against every accusation." "But," it goes on to say, adducing the contrary part—"but only once has Paul made the general assertion that Christ's intercession and God's justifying judgment cover every sin." We interrupt the quotation to note in passing that it is admitted, then, that Paul has made the assertion once. And now Windisch continues:—"Never does he in an individual instance point the sinning Christian to the forgiveness that will never be denied him. For the most part he presents the doctrine of justification in the form in which it describes the condition of entrance into the Christian community, in which it grounds the forgiveness of the enormous guilt that has accumulated in the past." "Accordingly," he continues, "Paul attaches directly to it the two other theories which have for their object the passing away of sin out of the empirical life of the Christian, the real sinlessness of the normal Christian." "Paul never says, Be of good comfort despite your sins, because they will be forgiven you. Because they are forgiven he demands now conversion too. And now there arises a schism of thought from the necessary orienting of the requirement of conversion to the expectation of judgment. Alongside the proclamation of grace, that believers will be saved from the judgment, there enters this requirement to leave off sinning because they will be judged. It is, now, the motiveing of this requirement of cleansing which makes the sin of Christians a problem. Paul plainly declares that

sin compromises salvation—the individual sin which is committed after conversion, after baptism.” There are four ways, Windisch now tells us, in which Paul knows how to adjust to one another the two ideas that all a Christian’s sins are forgiven and that sin is something abnormal, unsuitable in his life, which must disappear. What he looked upon as normal was that the Christian should commit no sins; then he would have nothing to answer for at the judgment. If he did commit sins he might renew his repentance and so wipe them off his slate; or he might expiate them in suffering. In either case he could still stand in the judgment. “Only one mode of conception reckons with the idea that a Christian remains a ‘sinner,’ or that his act of repentance has failed: the condemning judgment is not spared the sinful Christian. It is grace that nevertheless saves him.”³³ “Thus,” Windisch now adds, “the theory of conversion adjoined to the doctrine of grace is able to maintain the sinless character of the normal Christian, and nevertheless at the same time to reckon with the sin of the Christian.”

Surely the two propositions that Christians are as such sinless men and that only that one of four classes of Christians which manages to maintain sinlessness may be called normal Christians—are not identical. So soon as we allow, as must be allowed, that the Christian proclamation includes provision for sins committed after justification, whatever that provision is, we allow that the Christian man is not as such sinless. To say that at least the “normal” Christian is sinless, is a distinct misuse of the word “normal.” Not only are Christians not presented in the Pauline Epistles as, as a rule, sinless, but they are presented as never sinless. The sinless Christian does not meet us on Paul’s pages: there, all Christians live not by works, but by grace. What is true is that Paul presents Christians as in principle sinless: that is their fundamental character as Christians—although it is not yet realized by them in

³³ P. 215.

fact; they are all "in the making, not made." They are not seeking to obtain salvation by being good, but striving to work their salvation received by faith out into the goodness which constitutes its substance. It will scarcely have escaped notice that, after all has been said, Windisch is not able to avoid admitting that according to Paul, justification covers the sins of Christians also. When he attempts to set over against one another the justifying decree on the one hand and Christians' liability for their sins at the judgment day on the other, he is not able to keep them from fitting into one another as parts of one unitary conception. It is very striking to observe him, on coming to describe his fourth class of Christians—those who come up to the judgment day still burdened with their sins—compelled to say that they bear their punishment, it is true, but still are "saved by grace." When commenting on Rom. viii. 33,—“who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect?” and the rest—Windisch admits that it is implied that occasion for laying a charge against God’s elect could be found and that in, not their pre-Christian but, their Christian life. Their safety depends, not on the falseness of the charge supposed to be made against them, but on God’s decree of justification and the saving work of Christ, which was not confined to a single past act but embraced in it also a continued intercession. “Here then,” he says,³⁴ “for once the relation to the whole life of the Christian which is intrinsic in the doctrine of justification is brought to expression.” Why he should say “for once,” is not easily discerned. It is just as clearly implied in Rom. viii. 1: “There is therefore now no condemnation to those in Christ Jesus,” as we have had occasion to point out at an earlier point. It is just as clearly implied also in Rom. v. 9 ff. and Phil. iii. 9, although Windisch labors to escape the implication in both instances. Undoubtedly in Rom. v. 9 ff. Paul grounds the future “salvation” of Christians as exclusively on Christ as their past justification; and argues from the

³⁴ P. 188.

one to the other *a fortiori*,—their justification carries with it their “salvation” by necessary implication. Similarly in Phil. iii. 9 Paul represents himself as trusting utterly at the last day in the righteousness of God received by faith, in sharp contrast with any righteousness of his own whatever. Passages like these leave no room for attributing to Paul a conception of justification which confined its effect to sins committed before it had taken place; and as little a conception of the final judgment which supposed it to proceed solely on the basis of works done after justification.³⁵ After all said, it is the fact of justification which according to Paul is the ruling fact in the Christian life and the Christian destiny.

It will scarcely have escaped observation that Windisch is apt to give expression to the difference between Paul's doctrine of justification and that of the Reformers in sharp negative propositions. In a passage which we have only recently had before us,³⁶ he says for instance: “*Only once* has Paul made the general assertion that Christ's intercession and God's forgiving judgment cover every sin.” And again: “*Never* does he in an individual instance point the sinning Christian to the forgiveness which will never be denied him.” Similarly we read elsewhere:³⁷ “Paul himself *never* unambiguously declared that the forgiveness which the Christians experience passes over also to their new sins; he only acted on this principle.” And again:³⁸ The attempt “to comfort the aroused *conscience* of the sinning Christians meets us *only once* in Paul.” It will no

³⁵ On the rather vexed question of the relation of “judgment according to works” to “justification” see the excellent lecture by E. Kühl, *Rechtfertigung auf Grund Glaubens und Gericht nach den Werken bei Paulus*, 1904, and also the page or two (including a quotation from Chalmers) in J. Buchanan, *The Doctrine of Justification*, 1867, p. 237f. Compare further Paul Feine's discussion, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 1910, pp. 308, where the literature is given, to which add James Moffat, in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, II, 1918, p. 391 f. and G. P. Wetter, *Der Vergeltungsgedanke bei Paulus*, 1912.

³⁶ P. 213.

³⁷ P. 518.

³⁸ P. 526.

doubt have been noticed that each of these statements is carefully qualified, and that nevertheless they are scarcely perfectly consistent with one another. The two pairs in which we have arranged them are so related indeed that the universal statement in each is provided with an exception in the other. The net result of the four declarations is thus that it is allowed that Paul does all the things which seem to be denied of him—even though he has done them each but once. We have here, then, not even an argument from silence, but only an argument from relative silence: which at the most might suggest that Paul and Luther threw the emphasis somewhat differently in applying their common doctrine of justification. The real import of the matter is that Windisch is aiming all the time at the one thing he most dislikes in Luther's teaching—that Christians sin daily and daily need and receive forgiveness. At this, accordingly, he directly launches his most sharply framed negative assertions. "The daily forgiving of his sins to the daily sinner," he says,³⁹ "is a gracious benefit which is never mentioned in Paul, and which, when it is mentioned is never related to the fundamental religious position of the Christian"—a sentence which is so prudently guarded that it seems not to wait for a companion sentence to contradict it. Again:⁴⁰ "Confessions of sins," like Luther's when he says "we sin much every day"—"do not meet us in Paul and John (in this generality)." Should however, all that is said in these and similar assertions be granted, what do they amount to? Nothing beyond the very natural fact that in the few and brief occasional letters which have come down to us from Paul, much is left unsaid, or is only briefly and perhaps only allusively said, that nevertheless belongs to the essence of his doctrine, and in other circumstances and on the call of other needs among his readers would have been said with the same fulness and vigor that he has used in developing the aspects of his

³⁹ P. 525, 6.

⁴⁰ P. 525.

doctrine which he was called to emphasize. Paul has given us no systematic treatise; what he wrote he wrote in reference to the needs of the situations he required to face. It is enough that he has given us the doctrine of justification. We should not demand that he shall have developed systematically every element in it and given a place in his Epistles to each of its possible applications in precise proportion to its systematic importance.

The difference between Paul's position as apostle to the Gentiles and Luther's as reformer of the Western Church, carried with it necessarily a difference in the particular application of their common doctrine on which each necessarily dwells. In the very nature of the case it was the "former sins" of his readers which most concerned Paul—as they most concerned them; equally in the very nature of the case it was the present sins of their constituents that most concerned the Reformers—as they did their constituents. To erect this inevitable difference of interest in the varied aspects of the application of the doctrine, into a fundamental doctrinal difference is preposterous. It is as absurd to suppose that because Paul was absorbed in the forgiveness of past sins, he was ignorant of the forgiveness of present sins in God's justifying grace—or even ready to deny it—as it would be to suppose that because Luther was eager to comfort Christians, agonizing over their sins, by assuring them that they were forgiven them in Christ, he was careless as to the forgiveness of sins which say, a converted Jew might have committed before conversion, or ready even to deny that they were capable of forgiveness. It is Wernle, however, who in a few remarkable—and very extreme—sentences, written for another purpose, teaches us how Luther's situation in the midst of the long established Christian community, of necessity affected the particular direction which his interest took as he dealt with the great topics of sin and salvation. "We have never been sinners, entering only now by a conversion into the condition of regeneration," says he:⁴¹ "we know absolutely nothing of

⁴¹ *Der Christ und die Sünde bei Paulus.* 1897. P. 3.

sin outside the Church. The problem of the Christian life, as the Reformation framed it, and as Ritschl has stated it afresh, is this: how can the Christian be in spite of his sin, a joyful child of God?" Something like this was, we say, necessarily the form in which the problem of the Christian life presented itself most pointedly to the Reformers. As necessarily it presented itself to Paul most pointedly in the form of how the Christian could be a joyful child of God in spite of his past. In meeting the needs of their differing situations Paul and Luther inevitably dwelt most constantly on different aspects of their common doctrine. That is the whole story.

Along with Paul it is John to whom Windisch makes his principal appeal to prove that to the New Testament writers Christians are men who do not sin. "Paul and John," says he,⁴² "are the typical and irrefutable witnesses for the dogma that the Christian is cleansed." And he is eager to have it understood that they are independent witnesses. That they are united in testifying "that the Christian and sin are forever separated from one another,"⁴³ shows how firmly the idea was grounded in reality; and also, no doubt, how completely the pre-Christian conceptions on the subject were taken over into Christianity and made a part of its teaching and its life. We have seen how he has fared in his attempts to interpret Paul in this sense. His success is no greater with John, by which is meant in this connection mainly the first epistle of John. He already finds himself in great trouble with I John i. 5 to ii. 3. Contradictory statements seem to him to be set here side by side. John represents Christians as enjoying, as such, complete actual sinlessness. And he represents them as still sinning. Windisch deals with this embarrassing situation in the following fashion. Even those declarations which assert that Christians still sin, he says,⁴⁴ "do not presuppose that we sin on and on, and consider ourselves only to be in a

⁴² P. 508.

⁴³ P. 276.

⁴⁴ P. 258.

gradual process of suppression of our sinful nature (*Art*). They rather have in view a chief act, in which we confess the sins which *we have* committed (perfect tense) and receive now the forgiveness of sins and at the same time cleansing from every wickedness." This, however, is not at all what John says. He has not a "chief act" of confession in mind, but continuous acts of confession as sin after sin emerges;⁴⁵ and this confession is not brought into immediate connection with the perfect "we *have* sinned," as Windisch's representation seems to imply, so much as with the continuous present, "if we say we have no sin," where "sin" must mean "act of sin," standing as it does between two connected plurals. Nor can the perfect "we have sinned" in this context bear the sense which Windisch seeks to put upon it. When he continues: "'Cleanses us from all iniquity' must, like the preceding analogous phrase, be expounded as an *actual cleansing* of the man, which gives his life a new character," he is assuming the least likely sense of the word "cleansing."^{45a} Even on this view of its meaning, however, John is speaking not of a cleansing wrought all at once, but of an energy of cleansing resident in the blood of Christ and applied progressively up to the completion of the process. John in this passage is assuring his readers that their sinning cannot separate them from Christ—provided that their sinning be dealt with as it should be dealt with, fought against and brought to Christ, and not covered up with lying denials. He says his whole mind in the first verse of the second chapter: "I am writing these things to you that ye sin not, and if any man sin"—not "has sinned," as Windisch tendentially renders⁴⁶—"we have an advocate with the Father." John obviously understood himself therefore to be writing paranetically, and to have it as his end to deter his readers from sinning, and to give them comfort when nevertheless they fell into sin. He is, in other words, just

⁴⁵ See Hüther here.

^{45a} See R. Law here.

⁴⁶ Consult Winer-Thayer, p. 293 and H. A. W. Meyer on I Cor. vii. 11.

a “miserable-sinner Christian.” And this Windisch himself is constrained by the next clause—“for our sins, but not for ours only”—to admit. “The declaration that Christ makes propitiation for our sins,” he says,⁴⁷ “generally formulated as in Col. i. 14 and Eph. i. 7, is now here for the first time expressly applied to the sins of the Christian. The general formula might include this application; that it was not unknown to Paul might be inferred from the eighth chapter of Romans. But he never spoke it clearly out and it cannot have been current with him. It is John the Pastor who first makes use of it.” Having formulated this comprehensive admission, however, Windisch endeavors to save some fragments. “But even he,” that is, John, he adds,⁴⁸ “does not entertain the idea of a continuous operation of the propitiatory death of Jesus, which has for its presupposition consciousness of many daily sins. He is thinking only of the occasional sinning of one and another. The fundamental characteristic of the empirical Christian life lies in the ‘that ye sin not.’ Sin is an exceptional occurrence in the Christian life.” This is certainly to make an illegitimate use of the aorist, “that ye sin not.” Of course it means that John’s purpose is to deter his readers from committing acts of sin. To infer that he means at the same time that there were long intervals between these acts of sin is desperate reasoning. John says, “If we say we have no sin”—and we have seen this means acts of sin—“we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us.” Are we to suppose that he spoke these words with the reservation—“except of course during those very long intervals between sins which make our life itself a sinless one?” Or when he said: “If we say we have not sinned we make Him a liar and His word is not in us,” are we to suppose that it was with the reservation,—“this of course has no reference to the general tenor of our lives and refers only to the very rare slips of which we may

⁴⁷ P. 259.

⁴⁸ P. 200.

have been guilty"? The tone of the passage as a whole is not that Christians are sinless men who may possibly, however, be overtaken in a rare fault; but that Christians are sinful men, seeking and obtaining in Christ purification from their sins and striving day by day to be more and more delivered from them. This, of course, does not mean that sinning is according to John the characteristic mark of the Christian. Not sinning is his characteristic mark. It was as not sinning that the Christian stood out in contrast with other men. It means only that "not sinning," when understood in its height and depth, is a great achievement and—we shall quote Luther's words again—"Christians are not made but in the making."

That Christians can sin and do sin, as John understood the matter, is made abundantly clear again from I John v. 16-18, where intercessory prayer in his behalf is made the duty of every Christian who "sees his brother sinning. . ." The passage closes, it is true, with the declaration that "everyone who has been begotten of God sins not," and the easiest thing to say of the two statements is that they contradict one another. This is what Windisch does say. The ideal and the ideal-contradicting reality stand here side by side. John believed Christians could not sin; John saw Christians sinning. So, at the end of his letter we find him "giving an injunction for the treatment of sinning Christians which passes into a conspicuous confession of the sinlessness of the God-begotten."⁴⁹ That John is misunderstood when he is made thus flatly to contradict himself, not only within the limits of three verses, but in the general drift of his whole letter, is certain. And the present tense in the declaration, "No one that is begotten of God sins," appears to open the way to understanding it of the general life-manifestation rather than of a particular act. What John means in that case is not that he who has been begotten of God never commits a sin, but that not sinning is the characteristic of his life.

⁴⁹ P. 220.

We may say, if we choose, that ideally, in principle, he that has been begotten of God does not sin. It is probably best to say simply that this is what it is to be one who has been begotten of God,—not to sin; and Christians who have been begotten of God are therefore in process of becoming sinless. That they are not yet sinless does not prove that they have not been begotten of God, but that they have not yet reached their goal.

It is naturally to I John iii. 9, however, that Windisch makes his chief appeal: "No one that has been begotten of God doeth sin; because His seed abideth in him, and he cannot sin because it is of God that he has been begotten." "The most categorical assertion of the Christian conception of sinlessness in the whole New Testament," we read,⁵⁰ "is found in this passage. Like the wise man of the Stoa, like the miraculously blessed man of the Apocalypses, the Christian *cannot* sin. It is also clear that the *individual* sin is dismissed to the region of impossibility." That this is an overstatement is plain at once from the circumstances that here too as in v. 18 the verbs are in the present tense, and may not here any more than there be made to express individual acts rather than general characteristics of life. Windisch, however, appeals to the idea of "begotten of God." This must express, he rightly says, a creative act of God. "The inability to sin is therefore more than a moral, psychological, intelligible impossibility. That in the God-begotten the ethical energy could relax or occasionally intermit; that there should remain in him another nature which could come occasionally to fresh outbreak; that sinful acts could always be done by a Christian, without affecting the nature of his personality—all this is simply incapable of being harmonized with the conception of the begetting by God which is presented here. So also is the distinction between principal, ideal, incompatibility and empirical coëxistence inadmissible. What is begotten of God is the whole man;

⁵⁰ P. 266.

of him it is said that he does not commit a sin, that he cannot sin. He possesses 'actual sinlessness' not alone in his 'groundwork and basis.' It is with the God-begotten which John describes here precisely as with the Messianic man of the apocalypse of Enoch." The whole force of this very effective statement is dependent on the thoroughly unjustified assumption that it must be at once in all their fulness that all the characteristics which belong to a God-begotten man are manifested in one who is begotten of God. On this mode of reasoning we should have to contend that every man must be born an adult. The grounds on which development is denied to the child of God and the element of time is eliminated from his perfecting, are not stated. Once allow, however, that he that is begotten of God requires time for the realization of all that is included in that great designation, and that not merely in his empirical life but also in his very being,—and the over-pressure of the conception of which Windisch is guilty becomes apparent. "Of principal cleansing," he writes,⁵¹ "of a gradual execution of the task of cleansing, there is no question with John. All the ingenious distinctions which have been made in order to apply John's words to the present experience of the Christian, are without justification. John sums up the whole essence of the matter and all his several declarations when he declares that he that is begotten of God does not commit sin and cannot sin." It would seem only fair to John to remember that these phrases "does not commit sin," "cannot sin" do not perfectly convey the implications of his present tenses, and that he wrote I John i. 5-ii. 2 as well as iii. 9 and v. 18.

Windisch having himself indicated Paul and John as the two sources of his theory of the New Testament doctrine of the Christian life, we need not follow him in his discussion of the remaining books. We note only one or two points of special interest in passing. The Epistle of James has a certain importance as supplying what is in his

⁵¹ P. 279.

view "the first Christian confession of sin,"—meaning by that the first declaration of the constant sinning of Christians. His reference is to James iii. 2, "for in many things we all stumble," or "for we all stumble much," as Windisch appears to prefer to render it.⁵² The commentators seem inclined to take the "all" comprehensively, as including all Christians. That is Windisch's view also; and he comments on the statement thus:⁵³ "What is most important is the open, comprehensive confession of sin, in which the teacher includes himself. He had already called attention to the ease with which a man could fall into sin because of the multitude of the commandments. Now he substantiates the fact that all of us without exception are great sinners." And not only does James thus declare all Christians great sinners—just like the "miserable-sinner" teachers of the Reformation,—but he currently treats and addresses them as such. "Cleanse your hearts, ye sinners" (iv. 8), is the way he exhorts his fellow-Christians. "He declares," comments Windisch,⁵⁴ "that the Christians must cleanse themselves, because they are 'sinners.' This express designation has not been met with by us hitherto; it appears for the first time in the teacher who also is the first to give expression to his own consciousness of sin." There would seem to be little left in James's "miserable-sinnerdom" to be desired, especially when we observe that he actually did what Windisch forbade us to conceive possible in the case of John. "Of his own will begat He us," says James (i. 18), and Windisch comments thus:⁵⁵ "He knows how to extol an act of God, by which the Christian has become a new perfect creature. The perception that this begetting has not yet with those addressed penetrated into their external life, determines him to adopt the promotion of cleansing." It might be supposed that I Peter would be given a place by James as testifying to the universal sinful-

⁵² P. 292: "The Christians who all sin much."

⁵³ P. 288.

⁵⁴ P. 290: cf. v. 20.

⁵⁵ P. 286.

ness of Christians. It appears to assume throughout that its readers constitute a body of "sinning saints" who require continual spurring on to moral effort; and at iv. 8 it seems to imply that they, one and all, commit a "multitude of sins" which it would be well to "cover" with love. Windisch⁵⁶ does not doubt that it is the Christian body who are expected to "have fervent love to one another," or who are reminded, in order to give force to this exhortation that "love covers a multitude of sins." But he has a way of escape here. He says that "the multitude of sins" were all accumulated before their conversion—which seems inadequate in the presence of the present tenses.

The novelty which Windisch finds in the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi. 4-8; x. 26-31) and with it, in the Second Epistle of Peter (ii. 20 ff.), is the denial of the possibility of a "second repentance"; or, to express it in language of later origin, of the pardonableness of post-baptismal sins. Paul, says he,⁵⁷ never put the possibility of a new repentance in doubt; James expressly exhorts sinning Christians to come to repentance. In Hebrews on the other hand, "he who after baptism commits a serious sin or falls wholly away cannot repent afresh and receive forgiveness."⁵⁸ With 2 Peter, "sinning Christians are worse than never converted sinners," and "baptism is unrepeatable."⁵⁹ There are passages in both epistles which make this interpretation of their teaching difficult, or let us rather say frankly, impossible. In Hebrews there is the all prevailing sacrifice of Christ which atones for all sins (ix. 7 ff.). In 2 Peter there is the express declaration that the parousia is postponed, in long suffering specifically towards Christians, because the Lord wishes to bring all of them to repentance (iii. 9). Windisch has his way of eluding both obstacles; but we need not pause to discuss the matter here. The point of chief interest to us at the moment is that it is only in

⁵⁶ P. 240.

⁵⁷ P. 294.

⁵⁸ P. 312.

⁵⁹ P. 254.

Hebrews and 2 Peter that he discovers such an estimate of sin in Christians that it de-Christianizes them, once and for all. In all other writers of the New Testament he himself perceives that the way is at least open for recognizing sinning Christians as still Christians. In point of fact there is no single one of them—not even the authors of Hebrews and 2 Peter—who does not on every page recognize sinning Christians as Christians; or rather who does not, in fact, so speak as to make it very clear that they know no other kind. That Christians have broken radically with sin; that they ought to cease from sinning absolutely; that they must give account of their sins; this they all teach. That Christians are without sin—there is none of them who teaches.

We have treated the publication of Windisch's book as bringing the "miserable-sinner Christianity" controversy to a close. But this, of course, does not mean that the general points of view urged by the protagonists of the assault on "miserable-sinner Christianity," and especially their reading of Paul's doctrine of the relation of the Christian to sin, ceased to be held and advocated. These things had come, however, by this time, to be recognized as merely the particular opinions of a special school of critical students and had lost their interest for the general religious public, except so far as that public was interested in the history of contemporary criticism. We need further, therefore, merely cursorily illustrate the continued expression of these opinions in the later years of the first and early years of the second decade of this century, with a view only to realizing the extent and significance of their persistence.

When Wernle in 1897 published his book on *The Christian and Sin in Paul*, he expressed in its preface his indebtedness for his understanding of the Pauline theology of two of his Göttingen teachers. The terms in which he did this seem to imply that he felt no great divergence between the views he was about to publish and theirs. In point of fact, at any rate, both of the Professors in question

—Johannes Weiss⁶⁰ and Wilhelm Bousset—have expressed in their own writings views very similar to his. This is particularly true of Bousset, who is found in the end chiding Wernle for playing the part of a deserter from the party.⁶¹ “Really,” he tells us in this connection,⁶² “it is seriously Paul’s opinion that the Christian can no longer sin. All the passages to the contrary which have been adduced have little weight”—referring especially to Rom. viii. 31, Gal. ii. 20, Phil. iii. 12. Salvation is a supernatural fact to Paul: the “newness of life” in which Christians walk is nothing of their own manufacture—it is like the sunshine and the spring breezes to them; and walking in it is just basking in it. In an earlier book—*Kyrios Christos*—of which that from which we have been quoting is a defence, we are told with rather more prudence that “Paul had a sense of sin in his life as an exceptional condition,”—although it must be admitted that the general description of Paul and his teaching which is given hardly prepares us for the prudence of this statement.⁶³ Essentially the same representations occur also in the article on “Paul” in Schiele and Zscharnack’s encyclopædia. “Occasionally,” we there read,⁶⁴ “Paul incidentally recalls that even in the life of the regenerated man, sin is still present; but he looks at that, at the least, as an exception, a little shadow in the strong light (Gal. ii. 19). The conception of the Christian life as an eternal conflict in which man scarcely advances at all, or as daily renewed conviction of the corruption of our nature and reception of the comfort of forgiveness of sins, was alien to him. The Christianity of Paul can be understood only as the Christianity of conversion. He knows himself to have been converted in a particular hour: his life now, the present in its contrast with the past, ap-

⁶⁰ *Dis christliche Freiheit nach der Verkündigung des Apostel Paulus*, 1902, pp. 21 f; also *Paul and Jesus*, 1909, p. 321.

⁶¹ *Jesus der Herr*, 1916, pp. 47 ff.

⁶² P. 48.

⁶³ *Kyrios Christos*, 1913, pp. 155 f.

⁶⁴ *Die Religion*, &c. vol. IV. 1913, pp. 1295 f.

pears to him in clear, brilliant light. And he gave himself to the new light with all the heroism of which he was capable, body and soul. He could actually say of himself that he was conscious of no fault (I Cor. iv. 4). It is more difficult to understand how he could maintain this mood also with reference to his churches, whose shadows he saw only too clearly, and strongly rebuked. This mood with him rests, however, not only on experience, but more on an audacious dogma—the destruction of the old and the new birth of the new world must accompany the death and resurrection of Christ."

Somewhat similarly to Bousset, G. P. Wetter, a Swedish author, having the sixth chapter of Romans particularly in mind, writes as follows.⁶⁵ "If we are delivered from the sphere of sin, if we are dead to it,—then we have nothing more to do with it. Instead of sin, 'grace,' 'righteousness,' 'life,' are now the life-element in which we move, whose air we breathe. The Apostle sees everything absolutely; the one contradicts the other. The Christian cannot sin. The fact that in the actual life of the Christian sin obviously occurs, cannot destroy this, his faith (Rom. vi. 14). Paul can believe so firmly in this new reality, because it is to him not man who produces the new thing, but God. So often as we direct our glance to men, nothing is as it should be. Paul, however, looks to God, and therefore he never doubts." A. Deissmann would apparently like to say much the same, but cannot quite do it. He too has the sixth chapter of Romans in mind. "As a new creature," says he,⁶⁶ "Paul the Christian is also free from sin (Rom. vi. 1-14). He has been loosed from sin, but is he also sinless, incapable of sinning? In theory certainly Paul might subscribe to the statement that the Christian does not sin (cf. Rom. vi. 2, 6, 11). But the awful experience of practice would give him cause to doubt. Paul the shepherd of souls retained a sober judgment; freedom from sin is

⁶⁵ *Charis*, 1913, p. 46.

⁶⁶ *St. Paul* (1911), E. T., 1912, pp. 155 ff.

not conceived as something mechanical and magical. Side by side with all his moral exhortations to Christians to battle against sin, there are expressions of Paul the Christian himself, especially in his letter to the Romans (particularly Rom. vii.) witnessing that even the new-created man feels at times the old deep sense of sin. But in Christ the grace of God is daily vouchsafed to him and daily he experiences the renovating, creative power of that grace." It is essentially the same note that is struck by W. Wrede. Paul, says he,⁶⁷ says we are dead, are dead to sin, and the like, and yet every one of his exhortations implies that we are not at all dead to sin. Is there a contradiction here? Or does Paul's language merely anticipate what is to come? Perhaps it is best to say that what he says is true at bottom, but the external realization of this inner truth as yet lags. This much is certainly true: "the whole Pauline conception of salvation is characterized by suspense." This too is only a half-truth. But there is this valuable half of the truth expressed in it, that is much too frequently forgotten: Paul's religion was a next-world religion, and he never dreamed that he was experiencing here and now all that had been prepared by Christ for him. He had the Holy Spirit already: but he himself says that what he had already in Him was only the first fruits.

Perhaps we may look upon the statements in Weinell's *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*⁶⁸ as representing as fairly as possible the present state of opinion in the school which he represents, on the attitude of the New Testament writers to the sins of Christians. And if so we may place by its side two other works on the theology of the New Testament⁶⁹ published at about the same time and representing other points of view. From the three together we may cherish a good hope of deriving a well-

⁶⁷ *Paul* (1905), E. T., 1907, pp. 102 ff.

⁶⁸ *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Die Religion Jesu und des Urchristentums.* Ed. 2, 1913.

⁶⁹ H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie*, 1911; Paul Feine, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 1910.

rounded conception of the condition in which the question at issue has been left on the dying away of the active controversy.

It is of no significance that Weinel agrees⁷⁰ that our Lord did not expect His disciples to be without sin but taught them to pray, Forgive us our trespasses. That is allowed on all hands. It is more notable that his representations of Paul's teaching⁷¹ also seem to yield the case, although not without reserve. "We have seen," he says,⁷² "that according to our view of Paul too, a man's morality is the fruit of the Spirit. Nevertheless Paul did not hold Christians to be sinless; reality was too great a contradiction to that. He knew of the conflict of the flesh with the Holy Spirit even in Christians (Gal. v. 17 ff.), although these very words of his show that he holds precisely this conflict to be surmounted: 'Ye are not under the law.' Neither did he give repentance a place merely at the beginning of the Christian life, but thought of it as the sole and indeed the divinely appointed sorrow which should continue in it, 2 Cor. vii. 9f. It was, however, certainly his opinion that sin has no rôle to play in the Christian life; and he built on that, that the good grows in it like the fruit on the tree." This seems to be as much as to say that Paul recognized perfectly that Christians remained sinners, but that the Spirit was supreme in them and would bring all things right in the end. For Paul was of "the fixed conviction" that no Christian can be lost. Indeed he sometimes spoke as a universalist (Rom. xi. 12). For Christians he is, however, absolutely sure. When, at the end of the volume, Weinel comes to speak of the teaching of the later portions of the New Testament,⁷³ he strikes a different note. The high attitude of Paul was no doubt long maintained,—and here this is described as if it included a conviction that Christians "commit no sin, or if they commit sin, they are

⁷⁰ P. 187.

⁷¹ Pp. 374 ff.

⁷² P. 374.

⁷³ Pp. 628 ff.

punished, but still are saved, though 'as by fire.' " But by and by a change came, which brought a problem with it. Apparently this was because sins increased, and that, serious sins. Peccadilloes might be passed by; they were forgiven by God and man. But what must be said of apostasy, for instance? The Epistle to the Hebrews declares that no repentance will avail. In many writings, no doubt, the problem is not raised—as in Ephesians, Colossians, I Peter. In others the strictness is relaxed somewhat—as in the Apocalypse, where one more repentance is allowed. But the problem was now raised, and passed on into the later Church to give much trouble as the problem of post-baptismal sins.

When Holtzmann published the first edition of his *Text-book of New Testament Theology* (1897) he already knew W. A. Karl's *Contributions*, and cites approvingly its representation of Paul's theory of non-sinning Christians. It does not follow, of course, that he derived his idea from Karl. He appears to have been prepared to welcome it, when announced; and although he does not seem to have worked out the idea in detail prior to the publication of Karl's book, he is to be credited with independent invention of it. He speaks at any rate here in his own voice, and expounds⁷⁴ Paul as teaching "with heaven-storming idealism" that "with the passage out of the sphere of the law into the sphere of grace the dominion of sin has reached its end (Rom. vi. 18). The believer actually ceases to sin. But here too the bad reality does not correspond to the goodness of the theory. Sin works as a latent power so long as man lives at once in the Spirit (Rom. viii. 9) and in the flesh (Gal. ii. 20). Care is therefore always to be taken that the flesh does not rise and make itself felt (Gal. v. 16). Believers have, it is true, crucified the flesh once for all (Gal. v. 24): they must, however, always slay its members afresh (Col. iii. 5) and through the Spirit destroy the works of the flesh (Rom. 8. 13)." The scope

⁷⁴ Ed. I, Vol. II, pp. 151 ff.

of this statement, it will be seen, is that according to Paul, while Christians, being under the control of the Spirit, are infallibly saved and from the first are freed from sinning, yet, having still the flesh, they are continually impelled to sin and are forced to fight their way onward in ethical effort. In the second edition of his book, published in 1911, Holtzmann has retained this passage substantially unchanged.⁷⁵ A good many alterations in its language are made, and that for the purpose not merely of qualifying but also of strengthening the expression; many illustrations and supporting notes are added; but the statement remains in its contents the same. For Holtzmann at least therefore the state of the case in this controversy was not so different after the battle had been fought from what it was before. Paul is still thought of as defying reality—the reality about him and the reality in his own breast—and teaching that Christians are sinless; and the evidence which Holtzmann presents for his views does not differ in character from that which we have already seen in other like-minded writers. His judgments on the teaching of other New Testament writers than Paul follow also closely those prevalent in his school. For example, James knows nothing of Pauline sinlessness: Hebrews teaches that only sins of weakness and ignorance are pardonable in the baptized. It is Holtzmann's testimony therefore that the contentions of his school have suffered nothing through the controversy, but have come out of it unaffected.

Paul Feine views the matter from a very different angle, but although far removed in both method and judgment from Weinle and Holtzmann, is yet in his own way not untouched by the modern spirit. He looks upon the contentions of Wernle and Windisch with their congeners as being definitely wrong.⁷⁶ He is very emphatic that, in Paul's view, the Christian, though a renewed man and animated by an active principle of righteousness and life, is yet still

⁷⁵ Ed. II, Vol. II, p. 166.

⁷⁶ P. 420, note.

a sinner. "For Paul as for Luther," he says,⁷⁷ "this righteousness of the Christian is neither a complete nor a meritorious one, but the effect of new divine powers in the man. So long as man is 'in the flesh,' he is for Paul not yet freed from sin." "Even though Paul conceived the righteousness of life in the Christian, in communion with Christ, and in the power of the Spirit, as one that is already beginning and in part also being realized," he says again,⁷⁸ yet he is "far too sober-minded to look on Christians to whom the 'flesh' remains, as freed from sin. Therefore the justified also need forgiveness of sins." There was indeed a tendency "in the old church" to hold that free and full forgiveness was provided by Christ for pre-Christian sins, but not for conscious and serious sins after our reception into the Christian community. We may possibly see a trace of this in James (v. 20); it appears clearly in Hebrews (vi. 4 ff., x. 26 f.); and something analogous to it in I John v. 16. There is no trace of such a notion in Paul. He does not formally treat the question, it is true, but there is no difficulty in perceiving how he thought. To him justification is not merely an initiatory act, exhausting its effects on the sins that are past. He relates it to the eternal counsel of God and the efficiency of Christ's work of reconciliation. In it is given therefore God's definitive judgment on man. Even sin in Christians cannot compromise it; it remains in force despite all vacillations of the life, for God's faithfulness does not fail and He does not repent Him of His judgments. "Though Paul does not assert that justification includes also daily forgiveness of sins, yet at bottom that is his meaning." The passages which are adduced in proof are the Epistle to the Galatians at large (especially iii. and v. 4 f.), and Rom. viii. 33 f., Col. i. 14, Eph. i. 7 with an emphasis on the present tenses. In Rom. viii. 33 f., for example, Feine remarks that the present participles "who justifieth," "who con-

⁷⁷ P. 417.

⁷⁸ P. 420.

demneth," as is shown also by the concluding clause "who now intercedeth for us," deal with the Christian present. "The Christian feels that he is continually subject to condemnation, that he is surrounded by inimical powers, which seek to snatch him out of the hands of God and Christ. But God's decree of justification is always valid for him and Christ equally continually appears for him when he needs help." If this conception, however, is thus left only as an indispensable presupposition of Paul's it is clearly spoken out by John, who tells us plainly (I John ii. 1 f.) that when the Christian sins he has Jesus Christ the righteous as his advocate with the Father. The Christian here is conceived as still sinning, and living still under the continually applied atoning power of the propitiating blood of Christ. "The walk in full Christian knowledge postulated therefore for John as truly as for Paul the confession of our sinfulness and the necessity of purification through Christ's blood."⁷⁹ Passages like iii. 6, 9, v. 18 present an ideal. "The complete ideal is shown by the apostle—the Christian as he ought to be already here, as he will be when his abiding in God experiences no longer any intermission, and we have become God's children in the full sense. But the Christians who maintain that already here they are freed from sin, are pointed by the apostle to still fuller moral knowledge than they possess, and to the redemption from continued sin also which is given us in this life. We have no new Pentecost to expect. There is only one Pentecost. But the Holy Spirit who was then given to the Christian community as the power of Christ and the power of God, will abide forever in the community of Jesus, as earnest of the power of the heavenly life. He points us to a future perfecting even in the conditions of our moral life."⁸⁰

The very slight effect which all this long-continued and vigorously conducted discussion of the New Testament,

⁷⁸ P. 684.

⁷⁹ Pp. 697 ff.

⁸⁰ P. 698.

and especially the Pauline, conception of the relation of Christians to sin, has had on English-speaking writers is very noticeable and perhaps significant. There have been echoes of course, but little more than echoes. Orello Cone entered the discussion at its very beginning, quite in the sense of Wernle, and with verbal allusions to Holtzmann which may indicate one of the sources of his inspiration. "For his own part," he says,⁸¹ Paul "expresses no consciousness of sin from the time of his conversion, and no sense of the daily need of a petition for the divine forgiveness implied in the Lord's Prayer. With the 'old things' that are passed, the old sinful life, he has broken forever, and leaves them behind. . . ." What he thus held of himself, he held of others. "He regarded his fellow-believers from the point of view of his own consciousness of 'life' in the Spirit, so far at least as his theory of their religious state was concerned. . . ." "Such expressions," Cone now goes on to comment, "lend support to the supposition that Paul's missionary preaching was religious rather than ethical, that its emphasis was placed on the mystic effect of baptism, 'on sanctification' and on 'justification' (I Cor. vi. 11). His expectation of the immediate coming of Christ to receive the 'justified' believers into the Kingdom may have disturbed his perspective of the course of moral struggle which actually lay before his church. Hence the ethico-religious paradoxes." "The fact that doctrinally Paul made no provision for the sins of believers shows that he took little account of sin as a condition from which those could need to be delivered who had once been 'justified.' The atonement is not applied to them. Faith serves once only, and he who through it has become a 'new creature' is not conceived as again needing this salvation. Paul can hardly have thought that any one of his believers would be finally rejected when Christ should come." "This 'heaven-storming idealism' was not shaken by the apostle's experience of the moral delinquencies of his converts, which he did not fail

⁸¹ *Paul*, 1898, p. 366.

to reprove with due energy." It is a defective apprehension of Paul's doctrine of the Spirit as the Spirit of holiness, and of the Christian's progressive sanctification by Him, which has led Cone into so bizarre a representation of Paul's conception of the relation of the Christian to sin.

Kirsopp Lake, entering the discussion, with his essay on *The Early Christian Treatment of Sin after Baptism*, late enough to have Windisch behind him, takes up the most extreme ground possible as if it were a mere matter of course.⁸² According to him, the whole body of the first teachers of the Church were agreed that sinning after baptism—which is the same as after believing—is unpardonable, and it was only later, when hard experience had taught them that Christians did sin after baptism, that remedies for such sins came to be suggested. The essay opens with a fundamental assertion. "The most primitive form of Christian doctrine," we read, "held that Christians, as such, were free from sin. They had been born again into a state of sinlessness, and it was their duty to see that they never relapsed again into the dangerous state which they had left; if they should fail in this duty, it was questionable whether they had any further chance of salvation." According to Hebrews, we are told, wilfully sinning Christians are hopelessly lost. We are also told that "the same point of view was that of St. Paul, but in his Epistles the question is not a matter of controversy, and it is only implied or mentioned in passing." The evidence adduced, however, concerns only the sinlessness of Christians, not the hopeless state of Christians who sin,—which is the point which was raised. And the same is true of I John which is next appealed to. The latter part of the essay is concerned with the remedies proposed for sinning Christians. First rebaptism was proposed; it is polemically alluded to in Hebrews and Ephe-

⁸² *The Expositor*, Seventh Series, Vol. X. (1910) pp. 63-80. The essay had previously appeared in Dutch,—"*Zonde en Doop*," in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1909, 43, 9. The same material is presented by H. Weinell, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, ed. 2, 1913, 628, 629.

sians. Next came prayer for venial sins (I John v. 16 f.) and recourse to the advocacy of Christ (ii. 1). Then Herma-s suggests penance. And possibly we may add from John xiii. 1-20, footwashing.

The most extraordinary excursion of an English-speaking writer into this circle of ideas which has met our eye, however, is contained in the remarkable Kerr Lectures for 1914-1915 by W. Morgan.⁸³ These lectures are written distinctly from the viewpoint of the history of religion school, and the material which concerns us is practically a transcript of the representations of the German writers. The question of Paul's attitude towards the sins of Christians is raised in the form of, What provision does he make for post-baptismal sins? The answer is to the effect that he makes no provision for them. "The message of forgiveness in Paul's gospel stands at the beginning, and has no reference to lapses in the Christian life. For post-baptismal sins no provision is made. The believer, if he would obtain salvation must cleanse himself from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God (2 Cor. vii. 1)."⁸⁴ Paul does not shut his eyes to the fact of sin in Christians. "What we do miss, however, is a clear recognition of forgiveness as a daily need of the Christian life."⁸⁵ It is everywhere assumed "that the standing given by the justifying verdict is something permanent," but Paul "has no thought of connecting it with post-baptismal sins." Morgan finds the account of this in two circumstances—the radicalness of the change wrought by renewal, and the small place taken in Paul's consciousness by guilt. "The sense of guilt and of pardon were not the dominant notes in his conversion," and "they can hardly be said to be heard at all in his life as a Christian." He never confesses wrong-doing; he shows no sense of need of daily forgiveness; he never prays or teaches others to pray, Forgive us our trespasses. Precisely what Paul

⁸³ *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, 1917, pp. 151 ff.

⁸⁴ Pp. 152, 3.

⁸⁵ P. 152.

teaches is this:⁸⁶ "From the death and resurrection with Christ the believer comes forth a new creature. So radical is the change as described by the apostle that one might infer that the very possibility of sin has been removed. But such an issue he certainly does not contemplate. What, however, he does teach is that the old compulsion to sin has passed and the way been opened for a sinless development. . . . His expectation is that in normal cases the Christian will advance day by day in the knowledge of Christ, practice keeping step with knowledge, until at last he apprehends that for which he also was apprehended and Christ is formed in him. That a Christian should deliberately sin appears to him not merely as an anomaly but as an enigma. . . . The contrast presented by the grey reality to this optimistic expectation cost the Apostle many a sad hour. That Christians could sin and sin badly was all too palpable a fact. The fact does not lead him to modify his view of regeneration, but it forces him to descend from the high plane of the supernatural to the humble region of the categorical imperative. Your flesh has been crucified with Christ, he again and again insists, therefore mortify its lusts; Ye have received the Spirit, walk in it. By the stress of facts he is compelled to supplement his ethic of miracle with an ethic of will. They stand side by side unrelated." They certainly stand side by side, but why say "unrelated"? Paul certainly relates them, as, for example, in Phil. i. 12, 13. And why, in the interest of that spurious geneticism which is the bane of much recent criticism, represent the ethic of will as rising subsequently in time to the ethic of miracle? It is *there*, as soon as we know Paul at all (Thess. ii. 12, iv. 1 ff., v. 14 ff.).⁸⁷

It seems scarcely necessary to pursue this review of the ever-repeated emunciation of the same opinions farther. And if we glance over the whole course of the discussion

⁸⁶ Pp. 160 f.

⁸⁷ It may be reassuring to note that James Moffat in a brief review of Wernle rejects his whole point of view (Hastings' *DAC*, II, 1918, p. 380b.)

and endeavor to estimate its results, we are surprised by their meagreness. We have already suggested that they are practically summed up in providing the most radical school of criticism with an additional tenet in their historical creed. The members of that school now characteristically affirm that, in the view of Paul, Christians are sinless men—although they one and all agree that Christians, in point of fact, are nothing of the sort. The notion was only one of Paul's fanaticisms, thoroughly intelligible in him, no doubt, his antecedents and experiences being considered, but nevertheless symptomatic only of his enthusiastic temperament. On the other side no doubt the discussion has been useful in recalling adherents of the doctrine of the Reformation as to sin in the Christian life, from any tendency into which individuals may have fallen here and there to lose their sense of the greatness of the deliverance which has come to them in Christ in the profundity of their sense of the greatness of their sinfulness. The influence of Pietistic conceptions, emanating from more than one source, has been very wide-spread; and wherever they have penetrated they have tended to bring with them an inclination to give expression to the recognition of the intrinsic justice of the divine judgment on our sinfulness, by a treatment of the self in accordance with it. Hair shirts and flagellations are not popular in Protestant circles; but a mood and demeanor adapted to a deep sense of the iniquity and loathsomeness of our sins may be thought to serve much the same purpose. The jibe has not been wholly without justification that many have only enough Christianity to make them miserable. There is some evidence that the discussion of the relation of Christians to sin which we have been viewing has operated here and there to quicken in the minds of adherents of the Reformation doctrine the realization that Christianity makes men happy, not unhappy, that it brings them not sin but forgiveness of sin. In sequence to the discussion at any rate there has here and there showed itself among adherents of the Reformation

doctrine a desire to dwell rather on the blessings which Christianity brings than on the evils from which it delivers, rather on the glories into which it ushers the believer than the burdens from which it relieves him.

We adduce only a couple of examples of quite differing antecedents.

P. Gennrich, in the opening pages of his *Regeneration and Sanctification with reference to the Present Currents of Religious Life*,⁸⁸ draws a very vivid picture of the sense of new-creaturehood which filled the consciousness of the Apostles,—of "the joyful avowal of the actual experience of life by everyone who had experienced, in faith in Christ, the marvellously glorious and blessed effects that proceed from life-communion with the Lord." "How movingly," he cries, "the tone of personal experience strikes upon our ear in such confessions! What the prophets of the old covenant anticipated for the people in the time of salvation, and proclaimed in God-wrought confidence in the might and mercy of their God—that God would himself prepare for Himself a people in whom He should be well-pleased, would establish a new covenant in which sin should be forgiven and iniquity taken away, and would create in them a new spirit—that, now, might in truth and reality be experienced in themselves by all who were lifted by Christ into communion with the Father, who for Christ's sake granted them the children's right, and by Christ's Spirit created in them the sense of childship. And the experience was so transcendently great, the transformation of the whole inner and outer life-condition, which a Christian experienced who had come to faith and received baptism, was so immense, that an expression could scarcely be found which was able to compass the whole great fulness of what he had experienced and to bring himself and others quickly and impressively to the consciousness of it. This condition of new life into which the Christian knew himself to be

⁸⁸ *Wiedergeburt und Heiligung mit Begug auf die gegenwärtigen Strömungen des religiösen Lebens*, 1908, pp. 6 f.

transformed, was experienced by him as a wholly new life-state, conceivable by no human wisdom, attainable by no human art or power; as a new creative effect of the Almighty God in Christ through His Holy Spirit, who brought His almighty Becoming into the life-development of the individual even as He has brought it into the world by sending His Son; and so has worked a regeneration of humanity in Christ. In one word—it was the unanimous consciousness of the Apostolic and first Christians that they were new creatures of God, born of Him to new life, *born again*: that they were now first elevated to the stage of life on which life really deserves the name of life, because it is personal life in the full sense of the word, filled with a fully satisfying content, and supported by indestructible powers, *eternal life*.” There is much in Gennrich’s personal modes of thought which is not in accord with either Paul or Luther. But speaking out of his own point of view, it is very evident that he is here straining all the resources of language in the effort to give an expression, which he can hope to be something like adequate, to the greatness of the new life brought into the world by Christianity. This is the way, he says, the apostles, who did not teach the sinlessness of Christians, thought of what Christians were. This is the way Christians, taught by the apostles what their inheritance is, feel.

The second example which we shall adduce is drawn from a very different circle, and speaks to us out of a firmly grounded and historically trained Reformed consciousness. Herman Bavinck, quoting the contention of Ritschl and his successors in this discussion, to the effect that the writers of the New Testament were accustomed to speak of their salvation in accents of glorification, proceeds:⁸⁹ “There is a truth in this contention which should not be denied. The Scriptures can scarcely find words enough to describe the glory of the people of God. In the Old Testament they call Israel a priestly kingdom, elected of

⁸⁹ *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek*, Ed. 2, vol. IV, 1911, pp. 281 ff (Ed. 1, Vol. III. pp. 559 ff.)

God, the object of His love, His portion and heritage, His son and servant perfected in beauty by the majesty of God; and in the New Testament believers are the salt of the earth, and the light of the world, born of God and His children, His elect nation and royal priesthood, partakers of his divine nature, anointed with the Holy Spirit, made by Christ kings and priests, incapable of sinning, and so forth. He who rejects the teaching of the Scriptures about sin and grace can see nothing but exaggeration in all this; such a radical change as takes place in regeneration and sanctification seems to him neither necessary nor conceivable. But the Scriptures are of a different mind; they give a high place to the church, call it by the most beautiful names and ascribe to it a holiness and glory which make it like to God. The glorification of the church which takes its beginning with regeneration is, however, equally with justification an object of faith.” It is needless to say that this recognition of the glories brought to the individual and the church by the gospel does not in these hands in the least affect the sense of sin and ill-desert, necessary to sinners, against which as against a foil it is rather thrown up. The point which it is adduced to illustrate is merely that the fulness of this recognition of the glories of salvation—or at least the care that is taken to give it full expression—may in these instances be in part the effect of the discussion which has been in progress on the relation of Christians to sin. So far as this, advantage has been reaped from that discussion.

If now, abstracting ourselves from these individual effects of the discussion, we inquire after the real function served by this assault upon the Reformation doctrine in the great complex of the religious movements of the time, we can only say that it has operated for the support and advancement of the current perfectionist parties working in the churches. Looked at from the point of view of the general religious movements of the time it is, indeed, in effect an attempt to supply to the contentions of these per-

fectionist parties a scientific exegetical basis; and it goes without saying that it is the most elaborate attempt of the kind which has ever been made. Those engaged in this attempt, of course, care nothing whatever for the current perfectionist parties in the service of which they have nevertheless expended their learning and labor. There is probably no type of current religious thought and feeling for which they have less sympathy. And they care no more for the teaching of the New Testament than they do for the perfectionist parties. Bousset, in the very act of declaring that, among modern religious tempers, that embodied in Methodistic Christianity comes nearest to the Christianity of Paul, remarks that nevertheless to modern men it is abhorrent and the Lutheran is more acceptable—whatever he may mean here by the Lutheran.⁹⁰ These scholars have performed their service for the perfectionists while pursuing a very different purpose of their own. But in pursuing their own purpose they have been conscious all the time of possessing in the perfectionist parties allies to whose support they could appeal. There is involved in this a judgment as to the significance of the perfectionist movement in the history of Protestant thought, a judgment which is not left to the reader to divine but is openly spoken out. The purpose with which the debate has been undertaken and carried on has been to assault the Reformation doctrine of “the miserable sinner,” intensely distasteful to these men of high ethical aspirations and attainments. They saw in the perfectionist movements similar revolts against the Reformation doctrine of the Christian life and the process of salvation, and they therefore claimed in their promoters fellow-workers in a common cause. They have no sense of community with them whatever in their notions of what the Christian life is, in its sources, processes, attainments, issues: but they are at one with them in their common effort to break down the Reformation doctrine and have been glad to help them in their battle, by presenting

⁹⁰ Schiele und Zscharnack *Die Religion* &c. IV. 1296.

them with Paul and the rest, as their patrons—if they attached any value to that gift. And meanwhile they have derived this benefit from them in return—that they could point to them as independent witnesses to the essential correctness of their interpretation of the New Testament.

The points of connection between the two are too significant to have been neglected by either the outside observer or the inside worker. We find them therefore cursorily intimated from the very beginning of the controversy. From the one side Fr. Luther⁹¹ already remarks of Ritschl's mode of arguing on the matter and his exegetical procedure, that they "coincide with those of Methodist Smithism;" and later it becomes a regular custom to mark this conjunction.⁹² From the other side we find the writers of the perfectionist movements quoted by the assailants of the Reformation doctrine with a respect which is certainly notable and perhaps at times excessive. It is difficult to believe that, except as moved by a sense of party interest, Carl Clemen could have felt greatly indebted to Andrew Murray for aid in the formation of his views of Paul's attitude toward sin in his own life.⁹³ And it is impossible to believe that Hans Windisch felt the contributions of F. Paul to scientific religious thought very valuable.⁹⁴ The ground of the sudden interest of these ultra-"scientific" investigators in the exegetical and theological opinions of such purely "practical" writers, is that they wish to exploit the movements which these writers represent as aids in their own assault on the Reformation doctrine of sin and grace. It is for this purpose, for example, that Windisch introduces quite an elaborate account of these movements in the closing pages of his volume.⁹⁵ "There are now to be noted," says he, "some very interesting movements within the history of the Churches of the Reformation

⁹¹ *Die Theologie Ritschl's*, 1887, pp. 38 f.

⁹² Cf., for example, Bindemann, as cited, p. 12; Ihmels, as cited, pp. 76 f.; Feine, as cited, p. 420, note.

⁹³ *Die christliche Lehre von der Sünde*, I, p. 111.

⁹⁴ As cited, p. 2.

⁹⁵ Pp. 513 ff.

since the Eighteenth century, that may perhaps be considered reactions against the Lutheran Christianity which no doubt strives against sin, but above everything consoles the pious for their sins—the person of Luther is here left out of account.” These movements are named as English Methodism and above all in our day the so-called Sanctification-movement. The language in which they are introduced is very carefully guarded, but what is meant is simply that in these two movements, Methodism and what we know as the Higher Life Movement, with its continuations, we have “reactions” from the Reformation doctrine of the “miserable sinner.” And accordingly we are told clearly a page or two later, where the problem of sin in the Christian life is spoken of,⁹⁶ that “Methodism and the Sanctification-movement present therefore a reaction from the solution of Christian miserable-sinnerism which is fostered in Lutheran circles.” This representation is true. The perfectionist teaching of these several movements, whether in its crasser or in its more guarded forms, is a revolt against the Reformation doctrine not only of the continued imperfection of the Christian in this life where he enjoys only the first fruits of salvation, but of sin and grace in general, which constitutes the pivot on which the whole system of Reformation teaching turns. And we may count it among the most beneficent results of the discussion of the Biblical teaching on the sins of Christians which we have been reviewing, if we can learn from it this fact; and with it this other fact, that the appeal of these movements to the Scripture in behalf of their teaching has, in the most elaborate effort which has yet been made to validate it, completely failed. The most striking thing about the long continued attempt which has been made to prove that to Paul the Christian is a sinless man is the clearness with which it has come out that Paul knows nothing of a sinless man in this life.

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.

⁹⁶ P. 533.

THE RITSCHLIANS AND THE PREEXISTENCE OF CHRIST*

That the more radically inclined among Ritschl's followers hold to the views which he expressed regarding the doctrine of the Preexistence of Christ as tenaciously as do the much despised orthodox believers by the faith which was once delivered to the saints, may be shown, to single out one among several similar works, from Dr. Hans Heinrich Wendt's *System der Christlichen Lehre*. While Beyschlag's second English edition appeared in 1892 and Lobstein's work as early as 1883, the Jena professor reaches a very similar conclusion in the year 1907. We shall find the chief difference between his view and that of Beyschlag, that Wendt does not confine himself to the testimony of Jesus Himself, and that he dwells a little more amply on the ecclesiastical doctrine of the preexistence of Christ.

In Chapter IV of the second volume of his book, Wendt discusses "Jesus Christ's Sonship to God." Briefly summarized his view is as follows:

1. *The New Testament Sayings about His Sonship to God.*

a. *Jesus' conception of His Sonship to God.*—Here Wendt's ideas are the same as Beyschlag's; only a little more impudently put. The Sonship of Jesus consists of this, that Jesus stands in a vivid, reciprocal, most tender fellowship of love with God. From the statement that Jesus descended from heaven he draws the same inference as Beyschlag; but he adds that from all such passages it is evident that Jesus was himself "born of water and the Spirit" as he required of Nicodemus (John 3:3-8).

b. *The New Testament Writers* have some "thoughts in common" as to the relation of Christ to God. These are: that Jesus was a man like other men, burdened (*behaftet*) with flesh, i.e. the weak nature of the creature; from which arose the same temptations and sufferings for him as for other people.

c. *Paul* and the author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* had

* The first part of this article appeared in the July number of this REVIEW.

the same conception of Christ's preëxistence. Paul touches upon the subject but very briefly and occasionally; it is not the kernel of his teaching. In his chief representations of the "gospel" (Galatians and Romans) he hardly deals with the subject. This proves: first, that the preëxistence was not the centre of his preaching; secondly, that he looked upon the idea as already known and familiar to his congregations. And this again proves that the idea belonged to Paul's pre-Christian world of thought, that the promised Messiah and with him the other Messianic blessings had an existence already in the higher, heavenly world and were waiting there for their realization. Now on the way to Damascus Paul became certain, through revelation, that the crucified Jesus was the Messiah and so he got the idea that this Jesus-Messiah had preëxisted in heaven. Surely, these are bold conclusions. But why did not Paul cast away this Jewish notion of preëxistence as he did so many another old-fashioned Jewish conception? Because Paul understood that the *spirit* of the Messiah made his proper essence; and this spirit, being holy and divine, did not begin with the flesh, but existed before time, before the world existed. In the idea of the preëxistence of the Messiah he found the best expression of his conviction that the spirit, operative in Jesus Christ, was supernatural (*überweltlich*).

d. The Johannine Logos-idea is a little different. John 1:1-4 is undoubtedly linked with (*eine Anknüpfung an*) the Logos-speculation of Philo. For ὁ Λόγος in vs. 1 is about the same as the λόγος κατ' ἐξοχὴν, λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ of Philo. But there is, for all that, only a very loose connection between the two. No such dualism between God and the world as marks Philo's writings, occurs with John. And the first sentence of the prologue, though sounding so much like Philo, might equally well have been said by any Jew who was acquainted with Gen. 1:1-3; Ps. 33:6-9; Ps. 119:103-105. Thus we cannot infer from the fact that Philo conceived of the Logos as a hypostasis, that in our prologue the Logos is also understood to be a preëxistent personality. (Perhaps not; but how about inferring it from the Prologue's own words that the Logos "dwelt among us"?) But in the rest of the Fourth Gospel and in I John ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ is always used with the impersonal meaning of revelation of God, the same which the Jews had received beforehand from the Holy Scriptures, and which Jesus received from his heavenly Father. There is in the prologue only a

slightly personifying expression. Consequently, *λόγος*, here too, means revelation. Only with the "Son" of verses 14-18 is the reference to a person; and in this person the eternal revelation of God was operative.

From this reasoning we see that the few Ritschlians who, in writing about Christ's preexistence, deign to deal with John's prologue, seem to be a little embarrassed by that document. It appears somewhat strange that a phrase like *καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος* should be marked as "only slightly personifying." And as far as the assertion that *ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ* "is always used with the impersonal meaning of revelation of God," is concerned, this expression occurs but once in John, outside the prologue, viz. in I John 2:14. To infer from this one verse, that an expression like *Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος* means nothing but revelation, seems like building a house on a soapbubble. But perhaps Wendt refers to the words *τὸν λόγον σου* in 17:6, or *ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς* in 17:17, which is practically the same as *ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ*? In that case, however, would it be possible in the connection in which those phrases occur, to say of that impersonal word of God *Θεὸς ἦν*, as it is said of the Logos spoken of in the prologue? It seems hardly conceivable.

2. *The Ecclesiastical Dogma of the Son of God.*

a. *The Early Church* accepted from the apostolic time the axiomatic certainty that Jesus Christ was "the Son of God." In many circles this was first explained to mean that he was an irreproachable God-fearing man, filled with the Holy Spirit at his baptism, and therefore exalted to be the Messiah and Son of God. But this adoptionism was more and more pushed aside by the idea of preexistence, which idea was linked with Philo. The Athanasian conception conquered in 325 A.D.

b. This Nicenum has this fault: when to "the Son" not only a personal, heavenly preexistence was ascribed, but also a coexistence with the Father in full equality of essence, the idea of God's unity was lost. This was the important argument of Monarchianism against the Logos-Christology.

3. *Objections to the Old Ecclesiastical Christological Dogma.*

a. Monotheism is violated, which is fundamental. Two

views only are consistent with monotheism: either the incarnate essence in Jesus Christ is personal, but not essentially divine, or it is essentially divine, but not personal. Three persons are either a threeness or they are only "so-called" persons.

b. The Christological dogma is not consistent with the historic Jesus. The error lies not in the notion of a pre-existence itself. A pre-existence like that taught by Plato or by Origen does not solve the question of the origin of the soul in the human body, but it does not break the unity of man. The ecclesiastical dogma, however, does. For this does not concern a pre-existent soul, incorporated in the body, but a personal Logos, belonging to the essence of God, united with a man, who already was a complete man as to his spiritual essence. This implies a dualism in the one man Jesus. But in the gospels He is "a unity" without a twofold consciousness. (This representation of Wendt's, however, does not do justice either to the gospels or to the ecclesiastical idea of the *enhypostasia* of the anhypostatic human nature of Christ in the *Logos*.)^{38a}

c. This old doctrine does not do justice to the work of Christ. It is related to that theory of satisfaction by the death of Christ, which views that satisfaction as a satisfying of the demands of God's justice. This, however, is not in harmony with Christ's gospel of the fatherly love of God. The ecclesiastical dogma sadly fails to see that Christ's place in the work of salvation (*Heilsbedeutung*) is merely that by his preaching, work and personality, he taught us more clearly and fully that God is love, that He has an ethical nature and will, and that we all are His children, if we yield to His love after the example of Christ.

d. Wendt's Conclusion: The ecclesiastical dogma is a great failure. We need not find fault with the idea that Jesus Christ is the bearer of truly divine essence; but that the divine in him is conceived as a "pre-existent, personal essence," is erroneous. As long as the Logos was thought of as a bridge between God and the world with merely cosmological, philosophical importance, it was endurable, but further than that it cannot be tolerated.

Wendt's own view of the matter is given under:

^{38a} Cp. A. G. Honig, *De Persoon van den Middelaar in de Nieuwere Duitse Dogmatick*, Kampen, 1904, p. 74.

4. *The Spirit of God in the Son of God.*

a. The divine in Jesus Christ is the power of God, present and operative in his mind. For such a power of God, working in the mind of a man, we have the biblical notion of the Holy Spirit. Jesus is the Son of God, because He was filled with this Holy Spirit. This Spirit is not a person, but a power from God, or, God working powerfully. Thus Jesus was always conscious of his immediate communion with the Father. We should, however, call this powerfully working Father the Spirit of God, because thus we are better guarded against Sabellianism.

b. So, Wendt openly admits, we place ourselves upon the basis of the old dynamic Monarchianism. Only, we do not agree with the old Adoptianist view, according to which Jesus was rewarded for his piousness with the anointing with the Holy Spirit and the adoption as Son. The Holy Spirit was not the reward, but the power, source, of his ethical working. He had this Spirit from the very beginning, as well as the consciousness of his communion as Son with the heavenly Father. We must also reject the dynamic Monarchian distinction between the power and the essence of God, so that Jesus had but the name and not the essence of God. Essence and power are not really different. The essence of God is Spirit and the Spirit of God is power. He who has a share in the power of the Holy Spirit of God has *eo ipso* a share in the essence of God. In this way we can say (the Ritschlians love to use the old terminology even though they change its meaning entirely) that Christ was ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς and ὁμοούσιος; but not in the sense of Athanasius, who understood this of the Logos in the man Jesus. But the Spirit, the power of God, in Him, is ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς. And so there is a partial truth in the Pauline idea of preëxistence. The preëxistence of the Son, however, is not a personal, nor a real, preëxistence. The Son of God is not the Holy Spirit in the man Jesus, but the man Jesus Himself, in whom the Spirit was operative. Of this Jesus we can only say that he had "an ideal preëxistence," that he, as Mediator of the revelation of salvation, which should lead to the establishment of the kingdom of God among humankind, belonged to God's eternal plan of salvation, and that he was the object of the loving foreknowledge and predestination³⁹ of God. We can also, Wendt continues, call this power of God, operative in Christ,

³⁹ P. 379.

the Logos. For Logos does not originally mean something personal, but impersonal. And it is historically legitimate to use it in an impersonal sense; especially in the prologue of the Fourth Gospel. (Wendt overlooks the fact that if in the phrase Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος the latter is impersonal, Θεός, too, is impersonal.)

c. Jesus Christ is "the only begotten Son of the Father," Wendt informs us. But he is Son in the same sense in which we are sons of God. He himself never said that he stood in a qualitatively different relation to God than did others. He did not call God Father in another sense than He is the Father of other people. He says his disciples are not any more from this world than He is. The new birth of the Spirit in John 3:3-8 is a birth of which he testified from experience. He only called himself the Son κατ' ἐξοχήν, because he has first understood the love of the Father perfectly. (Is, however, μονογενής the same as κατ' ἐξοχήν?)

d. The Spirit working in Jesus in the same manner as in other men, we now see the relation of the divine and human in Jesus Christ. This was the main fault of the old doctrine of the two natures, that the divine was distinguished specifically from the human. We have to distinguish in man between σάρξ, "a part of the essence of the creature," and πνεῦμα, "that which enables him to receive and assimilate divine power." Jesus had this πνεῦμα in the greatest fulness, and consequently he was not an abnormal man, but exactly *the* normal man, as he should be according to God's purpose. And Wendt's closing remark on the subject is, "Thus prevails with us the saying that Jesus was man, simply man, like other men."

We have not deemed it necessary to make many remarks concerning the above representation; our aim was to show, by letting the modern Ritschlian speak for himself, that his ideas are borrowed from the older Ritschlians and that he uses very largely the same arguments which we have heard them use. We may consider it superfluous, then, to tire the reader with more of the same tenor. Whether we take Max Reischle (1902), Otto Kirn (1906), or Theodore Haering (1912), it is everywhere the same. With all of them the doctrine of the preëxistence of Jesus "evaporates under our gaze into some such mist as this."⁴⁰ But it is

⁴⁰ B. B. Warfield in this REVIEW for Oct. 1914, p. 683.

difficult to let the openhearted frankness of Heinrich Julius Holtzmann pass unnoticed, who, in perfect consistency with "the system," declares pretty much the entire world pre-existent in the same sense in which Jesus was a pre-existent being. He reads an "ideal preexistence" in the New Testament especially of such notions as "the kingdom of heaven itself," of "believers" (referring to Eph. 1:4 and II Thess. 2:13), of "the days of our life here on earth" (Ps. 139:16), "the actions of man in time" (Acts 15:18), the "grace given us in Christ Jesus before the world began," (II Tim. 1:9), the "presence of man with God from all eternity," etc. As said before, this is but consistent; from the Ritschlian standpoint there is no difference between God's decree and the preexistence of him or it which that decree concerns. And if they still desire to call Jesus pre-existent as the Son of God, there is no other way left to them than to travel the path of a gross Pantheism. That those, however, who have the courage to be consistent, are embarrassed by the *biblical* notion of Christ's preexistence, is natural. And we owe Dr. Holtzmann our compliments for stating it so plainly, when he deals with the troublesome notion of Christ's preexistence, under the expressive heading: "*Mythologizing and dogmatizing, speculative and mystical offshoots (Ausläufer) of the Theological Problems of Early Christianity.*"⁴¹

But not all the Ritschlian theologians are equally radical. Perhaps those among them who seem more conservative deal with the preexistence of Christ in a more moderate way, and we may say that they leave us the deity of Christ? Alas, it is not so. We shall try to show this from two representative modern theologians, who have made an attempt to clothe the old historic faith in this modern garment, Theodor Kaftan and Reinhold Seeberg.

Theodor Kaftan is counted by such men as R. H. Grütz-macher, himself a representative of the so-called "modern-positive" school, with the older school of Ritschl, especially

⁴¹Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der N. T. Theol.*² I, p. 477 ff.

with Julius Kaftan. Kaftan himself, however, is convinced that there is more difference between his "old faith" and his brother Julius's theology than Grützmacher thinks.⁴² And it certainly is somewhat difficult to say just where Theodor Kaftan stands, and to arrive at an adequate appreciation of his effort to formulate a "modern theology of the old faith." There are too many irreconcilable elements in his proposed theology. It may be, as J. Thijs remarks⁴³ that Kaftan's intention, that of harmonizing the old historic faith of the Church with the forms of modern thought, is worthy of grateful recognition, as springing from "love of the Christian religion." But this is assuredly as much praise as he deserves. The trouble is that his "old faith" is not the old faith and that his modern theology is less of a theology than of a philosophy. There is an inconsistency between Kaftan's rejection, on the one hand, of metaphysics, in determining the meaning of Christ's Sonship, his statement that "instead of philosophy, we should consult Scripture"; and on the other hand his following Kant in distinguishing between theoretic and practically conditioned knowledge. For this Kantian distinction affects the contents of his system as well as the form. Thus his theology bears the earmarks of modern philosophy and it can be and has been criticized from a philosophical as well as from a theological standpoint. We are not concerned at present to give an exhaustive criticism of this theology. The inconsistencies of Kaftan's "three principles of modern theology" have been pointed out more than once. Our interest lies in viewing his efforts from the standpoint of theology, and we shall naturally deal with his system more particularly in connection with the preëxistence of Christ.

In the writings of Theodor Kaftan, the preëxistence of Christ is alluded to only in passing. And from a theological viewpoint, the trouble begins right here. For the heart

⁴² *Moderne Theol. des Alten Glaubens*, in *Allgem. Ev. Luth. Kirchenz.* 1905, I p. 1089, II p. 1114.

⁴³ *De Moderne Positieve Theologie in Duitschland*, p. 159.

of one's theology is his Christology; and a theologian who begins at the wrong end in his Christology is on dangerous ground. In his *Moderne Theologie des Alten Glaubens*⁴⁴ Kaftan has a paragraph on "What is the old Faith?" We are told it is "faith in the Almighty Father, who forgives us all our sins and in the power of such forgiveness gives us eternal life, here temporally, there eternally; and all this through Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, who through his appearance, his life and death and his resurrection became the only Mediator between God and men; and this in the Holy Spirit, who through word and sacrament creates that faith in us which makes us members of the Church of Jesus Christ, and hence participants in all God's gifts in Christ."⁴⁵

This "through Jesus Christ" means, we are informed,⁴⁶ that to us human beings Jesus Christ is *the* Mediator, without whom God, God's grace and God's life, would be nothing to us. This mediatorship, as confessed by the old Church, implies three things: "that he himself is from God (*aus Gott*), i.e. his divine Sonship; that he maintained himself as Mediator until his death, i.e. his mediatorial death; and that God has proved him to be the divine Mediator in exalting him by raising him from the dead, i.e. his resurrection." The first point is unfolded in these words: "The man Jesus of Nazareth, stood in a simply unique relation to the living God, a relation which not only never before existed, but is also unattainable for all others, since it was constitutive for his personality."⁴⁷ We should not speak, however, of Christ's metaphysical Sonship to God. This, Kaftan warns us, is philosophy, a product of speculation, while the Sonship of Jesus Christ is "a divine reality of revelation." Instead of philosophy we should consult Scripture; from which we learn that the Sonship of Jesus Christ is really what the old Church understood it to be, and what it is represented as being by Kaftan. For Jesus' true Son-

⁴⁴ The following references are to the second ed. Schleswig, 1906.

⁴⁵ P. 37. ⁴⁶ P. 25. ⁴⁷ *Ib.*

ship to God, as testified to by Scripture, means, "that in him, i.e. in his person, the living God, God Himself, meets us;⁴⁸ that consequently in Jesus Christ a revelation of God has been given us which, improving upon and elucidating all thoughts concerning God, which come from other sources, opens before us the real knowledge of the true God, not in prophetic speech, but in personal revelation."⁴⁹

Against this one paragraph a number of objections could be urged, even when looked upon from the one viewpoint of its implied Christology. When Kaftan tells us that the Sonship of Christ consists of something "constitutive" in his personality, he represents the "old faith" in his own words, and into his own words he introduces his own thoughts. "Constitutive" is not necessarily the same as "only begotten." And this "constitutive" is no less a metaphysical idea than any other metaphysical conception of Christ's divine Sonship. Kaftan thinks it is, because he believes in a distinction between faith and theology. But this separation is impossible, as his critics have often pointed out. Grützmacher remarks pointedly that in this paragraph of Kaftan's book, faith is mixed with and shaped into the form of a real systematic theology. The idea of the "constitutive" element in the personality of Christ is as much of a theology as is the Chalcedonian. "It is only a different theology." Nor could it be anything else, for "there is no gospel without a definite theology, no confession which does not contain dogmatic sentences in the strictest sense of the word."⁵⁰ And when Kaftan replies to this by telling us more precisely what he means by "faith" and what by "theology," he does not improve the situation. For he says, "By faith I understand the immediate rendering of the revelation appropriated by faith; by theology the scientific and

⁴⁸ "With these vague remarks he leaves the subject" (Dr. C. Wistar Hodge, on "*Modern Positive Theology*" in *PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW*, April, 1910, p. 196).

⁴⁹ P. 29.

⁵⁰ *Die Förderung einer Mod. Posit. Theol.* in the *Allg. Ev. Luth. Kirchenzeitung*, 1905, no. 44, S. 1046.

hence historically limited (*bedingte*) formulation of faith, i.e. of the revelation appropriated by faith."⁵¹ In this explanation he first makes himself guilty of using the word *faith* in his definition of *faith* (it would be easy to define anything and everything if this were allowed), and secondly uses the word faith, upon the meaning of which he was to dwell more particularly, in the same breath with an objective and with a subjective meaning. That is not a very clear method of elucidating the distinction between faith and knowledge! From this we see how Kaftan's own Kantian distinction between faith and knowledge influences him even in summarizing "what the Old Faith is" (§ 2) long before he has stated the necessity of such a distinction in "What is Modern Theology?" (§ 4). Small wonder that the upshot is "that the Old Faith requires a Modern Theology" (§ 5).

Of course, if Kaftan desires to conceive of Jesus' Sonship to God in the way he does, we cannot very well deny him the pleasure; but he should not tell us that it is in harmony with Scripture, for it is not; neither with Paul, John, nor the Synoptics. As Kaftan, however, merely asserts that it is, we may content ourselves also with merely asserting the contrary. The only passage that is even alluded to, in order to show this, Matthew 11:27, certainly does not bear the evidence of such a thesis upon its surface. The assertion that Jesus' contemporaries understood his divine Sonship in the same manner is equally erroneous: "My Lord and my God." The "old faith" saw something more in Christ than a unique relation to the Father. And what was it the "old faith," following Scripture, saw in Him besides the supreme organ through which God revealed Himself? Exactly that which He was before ever God began to reveal Himself in Him, viz., His preexistence as God.

Kaftan, too, begins at the wrong end. He starts from the fundamental idea that Jesus was man and that God revealed Himself through this man. Beyond this he does not

⁵¹ *Mod. Theol. des Alten Glaubens*, in the same *Zeitung*, 1905, Nos. 46, 47.

venture to go and consequently he has nothing left for the preëxistence of Christ but a passing remark that Christ is "from God" (*aus Gott*). If he had begun at the beginning, making more of explaining the origin of this man Christ, how different his results would have been! But now from his superficial treatment of the preëxistence of Christ follows naturally his statement that Jesus' consciousness of his Messiahship originated from his Israelitic environment, though in coming into his consciousness, it went beyond the Israelitic limitations.⁵² This implies that Jesus was a mere man; which is far from being "the old faith." Accordingly Kaftan's rendering of the old faith in Christ's Mediatorial Death is rather vague. Whether or not God's righteousness, as well as God's love, had something to do with it, is not quite clear. And equally vague is the assertion that according to the old faith Jesus' resurrection means "the revealed reality of life, which is stronger than death."⁵³ And, naturally, what Kaftan says of the Trinity-conception of the old faith is equally far from being a true representation. Instead of speaking of three persons in one Godhead he tells us that to the old faith God is a personality.⁵⁴ And this personal God is the Almighty Father who has revealed Himself in Jesus Christ. This Jesus Christ is not the preëxistent second Person of the blessed Trinity, Himself God, but—a man. Kaftan is right when reminding us, "To the old faith, not the world, but the Word is the way to God."⁵⁵ That is why the old Church arrived at its faith in the holy Trinity—through searching the Word. Hence it is not clear how Kaftan can make the statement,⁵⁶ that "the expression Trinity has originated from the experience of God in the Christian life. The Church experienced God (*hat erlebt*) in His Son Jesus Christ, who, because of his Sonship to God, became the object of her faith, although no one but God is the object of faith." And this God, who revealed Himself in Christ, came still nearer in the Holy Spirit. But from the beginning the Church believed in but one God—

⁵² P. 31. ⁵³ P. 34. ⁵⁴ P. 19. ⁵⁵ P. 18. ⁵⁶ P. 38.

"The threefold, and yet in itself single experience (*Erleben*) of God forced her to the expression of faith in the Triune." In this we have the characteristic "ethical" tendency of seeking the basis of faith in Christian experience instead of in the Word of God. This tendency proves to be so strong in Kaftan, that he introduces it into his exposition of the old faith, although he himself recognizes that the old faith did not arrive at its doctrine in that way. And this leads to what is said in § 4 "What is Modern Theology?": "Modern Theology is that theology, which is determined by the peculiarities of the modern intellectual world."⁵⁷ Now the characteristics of modern life are three: the autonomy of the individual in the world of thought, which gives him the right to bow exclusively before an authority which has conquered him inwardly; the revolution of thought brought about by Kant (the distinction between faith and knowledge is meant); and the "sense for reality" which gives absolute freedom to science. Hence a modern theology is a theology which "bows to no merely external authority, which follows the paths of modern thought, which is conscious of its nature and limitations, and which is open to all knowledge of reality."⁵⁸

The right of such a theology, we are told, cannot be denied by theologians who believe in Christ; in other words, the "old faith cannot object to it. For (to limit ourselves to this one point), "the autonomy of the individual is after all something external (*etwas Formales*) and hence, as far as worldview and religion are concerned, something neutral."⁵⁹ This we fail to see. From it results the right to place onself above the Scriptures; and "historical criticism" is introduced. But there is a fundamental difference between the old faith which recognizes the Scriptures as authoritative and our faith as dependent upon their teachings, and this modern theology which places the seat of authority in the individual who has first to make out how much in the Bible can be admitted to be God's Word and then recognizes this self-determined Word of God as God's

⁵⁷ P. 74. ⁵⁸ P. 76. ⁵⁹ P. 78.

authoritative Word. Queer is the remark which goes to defend this criticism: "he whose heart and conscience does not hear God's Word in the Scriptures accepted by the literary critics, does not hear God's Word in the inspired Bible either."⁶⁰ For this may be so; but it does not follow that he who reads God's Word in Kaftan's Scriptures may not read something more in the inspired Bible, truths which he seeks in vain in the critic's Bible, for the simple reason that they have been rejected by him. Among these is the notion of a preëxistent divine Christ. But this notion belongs in the category of religious certainties (*Heilssicherheiten*), which rest upon the authoritative Word, and which Kaftan rejects; and not in the category of religious certitudes (*Heilsgewissheiten*) which are supposed to result from God's experienced Word. "A theology which is based upon a merely external authority does not suit us."⁶¹ With these words Kaftan makes an impassable gulf between "the old faith" and the "modern theology of the old faith."

Under the title, "Jesus Christus" two lectures of Dr. Theodor Kaftan's are printed in *Jesus Christus für unsere Zeit*.⁶² The first one is on "Jesus the Son of Man," the second on "Jesus the Son of God." These make the same impression upon us as his *Moderne Theologie des Alten Glaubens* did. The very order in which the lectures occur suggests that the preëxistence of Christ, and His entire deity as well, will receive but meagre attention. If the terms "Son of Man" and "Son of God" occur in Scripture it would seem that an unbiased mind would begin his explanation of the personality of Christ with "Son of God," since the divine is before the human. But Kaftan begins with "1. Jesus the Son of Man." We have learned, thus Kaftan, to confess in regard to Jesus: "true man and God." And we must try to answer the question, is that right? The answer to this question we can only get "from the tradition of history." "Not from the speculation of our understanding,

⁶⁰ P. 100. ⁶¹ P. 113.

⁶² Zweite Aufl. Hamburg, Schloeszmänn, 1907.

nor from the depth of our heart can we obtain the answer to the great question, Who was Jesus? but only from history." The historical tradition to be found in the Holy Scriptures, notwithstanding its human errors and faults, gives us historic ground under our feet.

That this requires two lectures is not only because of the riches of the material, but because there really are two sides to Jesus. The more seriously we study the problem the more earnest the conviction grows that here we have a personality who is at once a full human being, and rises "above the ordinarily human into the depths of the Godhead." But we have to start from his humanity. But why must we start with his humanity? If the sources recognized as historic at all point to some kind of a preëxistence of Christ, then here is the beginning of this twofold being, and in our valuation of him we should begin at the beginning. For in that case what he was as a preëxistent being must have influenced his humanity. If, say, these historic sources speak of Him as God before He was man, it is obvious that God remains God, and that the humanity of Jesus must have undergone the influence of this divine preëxistence, and that to such an extent that it cannot be considered apart from this perpetually present (because divine) preëxistent being. And this in fact is the method of the "historic tradition," the Synoptics as well as the Fourth Gospel, the difference being that the first speak of the human career of this twofold personality and in all His words and actions make the influence of the preëxistent mode of His being shine through clearly, while John begins at the beginning, dwelling upon Christ's preëxistence and the mode of his preëxistent being, and goes on to show what kind of a human being this "Word" proved Himself, when He "became flesh and dwelt among us." John, because by nature inclined to deal with the philosophical side of the problem, begins with the preëxistence of Christ; the others do not dwell upon it, but in reciting historical facts they show the influence of the underlying fact. Kaftan, however, although himself philo-

sophically inclined, (he wants modern theologians to walk in the footsteps of Kant) neither begins at the beginning, as John does, nor recognizes the influence of Christ's pre-existence upon his humanity, as do the Synoptics. Christ is man and to him this cannot but mean that he is a man like other human beings—to such an extent at least that he was capable of making mistakes. “That Jesus speaks as he does of Abraham, does not prove the historic existence of Abraham. He was a child of his time; hence he knew as much about Abraham and Moses as did his contemporaries and no more.” But there is more. He was tempted, which means “that he was open to sin” (*daß die Sünde für ihn in Frage kam*). The arguments in support of this thesis are weak, viz.: There are two kinds of temptations, lower and higher. We need not think Jesus was subject to the first, but the latter made a profound impression upon him; otherwise how could it be said of him that he was tempted? for temptation is just temptation. Hebr. 5:8 proves this, according to Kaftan, while Jesus himself has expressed it in Mark 10:18. Accordingly Jesus, although he never sinned, has developed morally.

It is obvious that in this representation not simply a complete human being is recognized, but a mere human being. For if Jesus was God and man, then a moral development is out of the question, at least in the sense of moral improvement, in which it seems to be meant; and the mere possibility of yielding to sin was excluded with Him, because He was God. And yet the temptation would be a real temptation, because there might be something in it which appealed to Jesus' sinless human nature. Thus when Satan said, “Command that these stones be made bread,” the temptation was a real temptation. For Christ was hungry and He had a desire for bread. At the same time, however, the desire to do His Father's will was stronger; hence He could not yield to the real temptation. It is not impossible, then, to be tempted and yet to be unable to sin. It is not impossible to be both man and God, as far as the

possibility of being tempted is concerned. Kaftan's conception, however, of Christ, "the Son of Man," as recited above, cannot but curtail his being, the "Son of God." That it does infringe upon it we learn from the second lecture.

2. "Jesus, the Son of God." That Jesus was more than an ordinary human being is evident from: first, his personality. For he (see above) never yielded to sin. Secondly, he wrought miracles. And thirdly, he arose from the dead. These three things point beyond mere humanity. Then what kind of a person was he? He was a prophet mighty in deeds and words. But, although a greater prophet than others, in this he was not unique, but only distinguished (*nicht einzigartig, nur eigenartig*). But that he was "without sin," (although tempted to sin), shows the origin of his personality to have been different from ours; that points to a unique origin from God (*einzigartiges gewordensein aus Gott*). And his true resurrection, what does that mean? A different end, inconceivable for us. The risen one—where is He? The only answer is, in God, in a unique way in God. Conclusion: "The man Jesus of Nazareth stands in a simply unique relation to God."⁶³ This, Kaftan asserts, can also be proved from the record of Jesus' own testimony to himself in the gospels. Jesus, the Son of God! We are finally told, that no mistaking Kaftan may be possible: "I understand this Son of God as the pregnant expression of his unique being out of God and in God." And this he tries to impress upon the minds of his hearers by a frequent repetition of the words: "*Ja, Jesus Gottes Sohn.*" Yes, he believes in Jesus' Sonship to God and with this phrase he gives utterance to the identical faith of Jesus himself, of the apostles and the apostolic Church. But . . . at the close of his lecture he refers with just a few words to "the beginning of the Gospel of John: In the beginning was the Word." What this important phrase which dominates John's entire gospel means, we are not told. It is dealt with in a few lines, with a passing remark.

⁶³ P. 154.

We are told that Logos means word, but also thought, mind (*Gedanke, Vernunft*). We are reminded that in Jesus' time a current of thought existed which we are wont to call the Logos-speculation. It dealt with the speculation how the eternal, the divine, could have assumed an earthly form and how it actually did so. We are told that it is a much debated question whether the Gospel of John in its prologue has this Logos-philosophy in mind, yes or no. We are informed that it may be so, and that it may not be so. And if so it means that John wanted to show to his contemporaries in a way which was intelligible to them, who Jesus was. This manner of dealing with the preëxistence of Christ is the more remarkable since only a few pages earlier we read, "The Gospel of John was written later than the gospels of the Synoptists. The greater the distance, the more the essentials step into the foreground."⁶⁴ But if this be so why then in building a statue of Jesus should we make so little of the foundation of this trustworthy image of John's? Why not rather in utilizing John's record begin where he begins, the more so since his starting point is "in the beginning?"

Jesus, the Son of God, is he also true God? Yes, Kaftan answers, if only this be rightly understood. Whether the holy Scriptures call him God is an open question (*sic!*). Let us mark Kaftan's word: "God is not a man—that is certain." Jesus is not like the prophets to whom God gives His Spirit; but Jesus is the personal complete revelation of God—Jesus, the Son of God, because God reveals Himself fully in Jesus. There is nothing else in the designation, Son of God, for a Theodor Kaftan to whom the doctrine of the two natures in Jesus is "inconsistent with clear thinking."⁶⁵

It seems that Theodor Kaftan overemphasizes the human side and denies the divine in Christ more boldly as the years pass. In his *Moderne Theologie des Alten Glaubens*, the second edition of which was published in 1906, there is a circumspect terminology. In his *Jesus Christus* of 1907

⁶⁴ P. 155. ⁶⁵ P. 162.

we are still permitted to call Jesus "true God," "if only rightly understood." In his *The Man Jesus Christ, the Only Mediator between God and Man*⁶⁶ we read four times within five pages, "Jesus Christ is the Mediator, not God." "There is one God . . . Christ is not this God." To be sure, the title of this essay is taken from I Tim. 2:5, and Kaftan is right in saying that Paul by calling Jesus a man did not deny that there was another side to Him. But Kaftan's unfolding of the import of this other side savors more of Ritschl than of Paul. For, according to Kaftan Christ is the Mediator in a three-fold sense. First because he imparts to us the necessary knowledge of God, the practical, experimental knowledge of God, from which "we derive the strength in all temptations of the rough reality to endure by our faith in the Father who is in heaven." In Christ and in Christ alone we know, "I believe in God the Father." All the disciples of Ritschl tell us the same. Again, we need communion with God. Unlike philosophy, religion is not satisfied with knowledge of God, but it needs communion with Him. We sinners, however, are separated from God. But "He on the cross is the personal bearer of the holy love of God." When to this Ritschlian conception is added, "which (love of God) in punishing the sins, redeems the sinner," it is at once softened by the warning that we should not err here by fostering superstitious thoughts of judge-like bills spanning heaven and earth. The third aspect of Christ's Mediatorship consists of the fact that only through Christ does God reign over men. God rules over all; but over His people He does not wish to rule in the same manner in which man domineers the animal world: through blind submission. He desires to reign in their hearts. And this regimen of God has been realized by Christ who preached, "the kingdom of God is at hand." Through the regimen of Christ whose sitting at the right hand of God means "that the exalted one par-

⁶⁶ *Der Mensch Jesus Christus der einige Mittler zwischen Gott und den Menschen. Bibl. Zeit- u. Streitfragen*, 1908, pp. 1-37.

ticipates in God's world-regimen," the eternal kingdom is established in the soul of man.

These are typically Ritschlian ideas. Even if Kaftan denies that he is a Ritschlian, we believe with Grützmacher, Hodge and Thijs, that he is a Ritschlian.⁶⁷ And that Ritschl's ideas should influence Kaftan's approach to our subject, is a matter of course. To the Ritschlians Jesus is a (great) man. And he who believes that would naturally make short work of the notion of his preëxistence. But the powerful influence of Ritschl with one like Kaftan is all the more remarkable since his theological convictions would naturally lead him to a reversed manner of approaching the subject, viz., John's way of dealing with it. For Kaftan calls the Fourth Gospel "the chief Gospel." Although the Fourth Gospel pictures the same Jesus the first three portray, yet, (according to Theodor Kaftan) it emphasizes more strongly than these, that "God was in Jesus Christ." Why then run the danger of falling into the fault which Kaftan himself calls "the order of the day" that of "underestimating the historical value of this chief gospel?"⁶⁸ by ignoring its prologue? Ah! those philosophical notions borrowed from a Kant and a Ritschl, resulting in a theology which fears to be called unchristian, but does not aim high enough to merit the name of Christian!

A still more confused impression is made by the writings of Reinhold Seeberg. Perhaps he, too, would object to being called a Ritschlian. And yet, although there are certain points of difference between Kaftan's Modern Theology of the Old Faith and Seeberg's Modern Positive Theology, and although the two movements originated in-

⁶⁷ "Though Kaftan may be right in saying that he is not a Ritschlian, that he does not accept Ritschl's Theology ('but that Ritschl's Theology should be my theology, at this thought my living soul turns both stiff and cold'), yet it is hardly to be denied that he is to be counted with the school of Ritschl, and that he cannot say of his theology: 'As far as the contents are concerned, it is like the Lutheran Confession.'" Thijs, *op. cit.*, p. 201; cp. pp. 163 ff.

⁶⁸ P. 31.

dependently of one another, as far as the main points of the proposed Christologies are concerned the results are very much the same.⁶⁹ Seeberg seems to be tossed to and fro between breaking away from the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity and holding to its contents. Hence his *Zum dogmatischen Verständnis der Trinitätslehre*⁷⁰ appears to be singularly indigestible food.

We are glad, indeed, to hear from a man like Seeberg that the idea of the Trinity, "far from being a product of Platonizing reflections, is on the contrary fundamental to the oldest Christianity," as may be proved from the New Testament as well as from the Apostolic Fathers.⁷¹ But—we regret to find his representation of what the Scriptures teach concerning the Trinity not in all things exact. When we read on p. 347, "God's Spirit in the biblical sense is God's operating presence, Spirit is power (*Kraft*) and energy," this does not well harmonize with Acts 5:3, 4. For how could one be said to have sinned against power and energy, even if that be God's power and energy? For if it be said, God's power and energy is God Himself as He works, then the entire distinction between the Spirit (being that energy) and God (the Father) is annihilated. On the other hand "power and energy" is an impersonal conception. We can sin against the one whose that power and energy is, but not against his power and energy. Nor do we understand how Seeberg can identify Christ, the Lord, and the Spirit by a mere reference to II Cor. 3:17, cf. I Cor. 1:24; 6:17; 15:45; I Peter 4:14." Nor how he can identify the Spirit with the bride or the wife of Christ in Rev. 21:2, 9, and with the

⁶⁹ For the differences between the two schools consult C. W. Hodge, *op. cit.*, and J. Thijs, *op. cit.*, p. 177 seq. According to Grützmacher the modern positive school does not separate faith and theology; consequently their position in regard to the old dogma is more positive; while on the other hand they conceive of modern life in a different way—not like Kaftan, as if there were a constant force for a hundred years long, and hence they become more modern than Kaftan.

⁷⁰ In *Theologische Studien Theodor Zahn dargebracht*, Leipzig, Deichert, 1908.

⁷¹ P. 346.

holy Jerusalem in Rev. 21:10. The Father, Seeberg states, is also called Spirit (John 4:24; cf. Is. 31:3). But the last reference, Is. 31:3, suggests rather that "Spirit" is sometimes used in the more general sense of that which has no visible appearance; so, if Seeberg takes John 4:24 in the sense of Is. 31:3, why does he have to identify the Father as well as the Son with the Spirit? From these assumptions he concludes that "God as Father has in view and causes that all things originate and exist, while Christ, the Lord, exercises (*ausüben*) the divine power of salvation, hence He works in history; while the same forces (*Wirkungen*) of God, directing themselves to the individuals (*sich richten auf*), who are being brought into the mass that is saved by Christ, are the Spirit." Upon this basis, which, although in a somewhat changed form, reminds one more of modalism than of the Scriptures, Seeberg builds his own conception of the Trinity.

Seeberg likes to remind his readers that we have one personal God. "The personal element is not only peculiar to the threefoldness, but also to the unity, however that may be explained."⁷² Now it may be right to say that God is a Personal God, since His is the threefold Personality of the three Persons, but it is not right because of this fact to reject the distinction between the three Persons, as Seeberg does; for the Three, although each possesses divine Personality, are at the same time distinguished from each other by their personal properties. And equally false is the substituting of Three Acts of Will in God for the three Persons. "The divine will that the Church originate and exist in history is the Son." But "to will an end is always the work of a person," and consequently, inasmuch as Christ is divine will, he is also acknowledged as the Person of God (*die Person Gottes*). And the Holy Spirit is God's will that individuals be brought to Christ and subjected to Him. But this is also a personal will since it too aims at an end; hence the Holy Spirit is also a "divine person." From this follows, as indeed Seeberg recognizes, that the Son and the Spirit are identical.⁷³

⁷² P. 351.⁷³ P. 352.

As to God the Father, Seeberg calls Him "the divine will that the world be, become and shall be; which gives utterance to Romans 11:36 as well as to the scheme (*Schema*) creation, preservation and government." But now Seeberg informs us that the will of the Son and the will of the Spirit, although distinct from the Father's will, are in a sense His will, since they presuppose the Father-will. For without the will that the world be and that the world be God's world, the will that there be a church of God would be just as impossible as the will that this one or that one become a member of the Church of God. The will of the Son and of the Spirit do not necessarily follow from the will of the Father; hence they are a will of their own; for the Father's will that the world be His might have been realized in a different way than it now is through the will of the Son and the Spirit. Nevertheless the Father's will produces the reality which becomes the possibility of the operation of the Son's will. That is why the Father is simply called $\delta \Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$; and that is why "every good gift and every perfect gift cometh down from the Father" (James 1:17).

This then is Seeberg's faith in the Trinity. There are three different wills in God, each successive will dependent upon the former;⁷⁴ each one finally carrying out the Father's will; while "in each '*Wills-action*' the whole personality actualizes itself" (*sich aktualiziert*).⁷⁵ God is one and He is a person. But Seeberg speaks of God as a threefold person. For the essence of personality is "self-determination,"⁷⁶

⁷⁴ "One might phrase it thus: because the Father wills the Son wills, and because the Son wills the Spirit wills. This phraseology, however, is correct only when 'because' is taken in the sense of the ground and the possibility, but not when taken in the sense of the operative cause or of necessity" (p. 355).

⁷⁵ P. 362.

⁷⁶ "Self-determination, however, is the essence of personality," p. 360. Elsewhere Seeberg gives these definitions of personality: "Person at one time, with the Church Fathers, meant the individual (*das Einzelwesen*), now the word signifies the spiritual essence (*Wesen*) of the individual" (*Grundwahrheiten d. Christl. Rel.*, 1906, p. 115). Personality (*Person*) is nothing else than conscious personal will." (*ib.*, p. 118).

which each one of the three wills has. Hence there is a threefoldness (*Dreifaltigkeit*) of Personal life, while the entire divine personality expresses itself in the act of each one of the wills. Yet on the other hand there is no operation of God and no deed of God which does not necessarily result from one of these three wills of God.

To us the representation described above seems a beautiful substitute for the old biblical and church-historical faith in the Trinity, upon which our salvation depends as a door turns on its hinges. Beautiful, for all the elements seem to be there: the unity, the threeness and the trinity. But—for all that we are dealing with a substitute; and as such it is useless. We are not contending for words and names. "What is in a name?" might here be asked. *Υπόστασις, πρόσωπον, persona*—subsistence, substance, person, will—all these are human words, denoting human things, and *eo ipso* they are all inadequate to express things divine. Three persons in one God, as well as Father, Son and Spirit, provide after all poor phraseology when we desire to express the fulness of God, or, rather, when we are trying to give utterance to the inadequate conceptions we finite beings are able to entertain concerning His fulness.⁷⁷ But—in *cauda venenum!* From the last four pages of Seeberg's essay on the Trinity we learn more than from the first twenty-four. Seeberg, to be sure, even speaks of "the three persons in whom this God reveals Himself as active." And he claims that his theory is more like that of Athanasius than anything else. But we cannot be deluded by his use of the expression "three persons" into believing that his three wills in God are anything like what we are wont to understand by the three persons in God. If the divine will of the Son were an adequate conception of the divine person of the Son Seeberg would not have told us that this will became historical "by entering into the actions (*Wirken*) of the man Jesus and so became a historical factor in the coherent human race."

⁷⁷ Cf. Calvin's leniency as to the words by which this faith is expressed (*Inst.* I, 13, 5).

A divine person may assume human nature and still abide a divine person. This will of Seeberg's, on the contrary, is a divine power, entering into a human person. According to the old faith, Jesus is a divine person; to Seeberg he is a human person; and on this standpoint there may be a difference of degree between God's indwelling power in Jesus and God's indwelling power in other human beings, but never will Christ be as much superior to us as God is higher than man. That this is a legitimate conclusion, is also evident from what Seeberg says in regard to the working of the Holy Spirit. "As the Christ-will became historical in the man Jesus, so the Spirit-will becomes historical in the spiritual influence of Christ-believers among themselves and upon the world. And as all historic life has its origin in one person and its realization in a multitude of persons, so the Christ-will has the one man Jesus for an all-sided and comprehensive organ of his activities, while the Spirit-will needs single "activities of human persons for his organs." These words obviously contain the *cor cordis* of Seeberg's theory of the Trinity. God works in men, in different men, and in a great number of men. He works in the man Jesus, and when He thus carries out His divine will in and through the man Jesus, Seeberg calls that the will of the Son, or the second personal will of God. But God likewise works in other men, and when He carries out His divine will in and through these Seeberg calls that the operation of the Spirit-Will or the third personal will of God. But what is this but a substitute doctrine for the Trinity, dwindling into nothing upon closer investigation? And now we are not surprised that we find but a passing reference made in Seeberg's article to the great passages which deal with the preexistence of Christ, and that we look in vain for an exegesis of such passages as John 1:1, I Cor. 8:6, Col. 1:16. For how could these be made to fit into Seeberg's theory of the Trinity?

We do not need to say much about Seeberg's more popular *Grundwahrheiten der Christlichen Religion*. We find

in it no reference to the preëxistence of Christ. How could it be otherwise, if Jesus is a man in whom the will of God becomes a historically operative force?⁷⁸ The idea in the twelfth lecture is the same. There is only one difference. Since the topic dealt with here is not the Trinity but the historic person of Christ, the mere humanity of Jesus comes out more plainly. God created the man Jesus as His organ, just as He once created the first man as his organ. "From the first moment of his existence [for he is a creature], God influenced him and saturated (*durchdrang*) his feeling, thinking and willing. Thus the man Jesus became 'the Son of God.'"⁷⁹ Here this theory is fortunately called by the modest name of a "hypothesis." But this divine will wrought in the man Jesus so powerfully and so constantly that his will was always the same as God's will. When Jesus works it is God working through him. Hence Seeberg sees fit to call him God. But we cannot see anything but a man in Seeberg's Jesus, and when he tells us that the difference between Christ and the Christian is that "what we receive through him, he receives from God, and what is found in us fragmentarily, *gehemmt und zerstreut*, was found completely in him," it seems to us that this Christ is more of an example, more of a human, though unattainable, ideal, than a divine Saviour, who takes away the sin of the world: "This man was in this world what we hope to be in the next world, God's medium (*Mittel*) and God's organ, unlimitedly, wonderfully, and boundlessly." We need not go on quoting Seeberg. To him "Jesus was the first Christian and he was the sole believer, in the full sense of the word, known to the history of mankind."⁸⁰ And yet Seeberg tells us that Jesus "himself as to the real contents of his soul is God."⁸¹

We are not blind to the beauty of Seeberg's writings; we

⁷⁸ P. 117 of the Fifth German edition, 1910.

⁷⁹ P. 117, 118. The reader will have noticed the close likeness between the view of Seeberg and that of Schultz, as described above, p. 509f.

⁸⁰ P. 109.

⁸¹ P. 120.

gladly confess that we have found a pleasing warmth of feeling and glowing piety in them. He is vividly impressed with guilt and sin; and he speaks of Christ as the "Saviour" in ardent language.⁸² And we feel sympathy for a man so profound and so pious when he complains of "the unchristian distrust one meets nowadays, even among Christians."⁸³ But after all has been said, the cause of it all is Reinhold Seeberg himself. His compromising standpoint cannot but dissatisfy both conservative and liberal theologians. While a Karl Thieme rejects him⁸⁴ as too conservative, Drs. Hodge and Thijs deny that he is a conservative at all and accuse him of abandoning the essentials of the Christian religion. Reinhold Seeberg should expect nothing else.⁸⁵

Hammond, Ind.

JAN KAREL VANBAALEN.

⁸² *Die Person Christi der feste Punkt im fließenden Strom der Gegenwart* in *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, 1903, p. 454-456.

⁸³ *ib.*, p. 454; cf. *Grundwahrh.* Vorwort pp. VII & VIII.

⁸⁴ In *Zeitschrift für theol. u. Kirche*, 1908, pp. 431 ff.

⁸⁵ The antiquity of the Ritschlian conception and the superiority of the orthodox view the writer has attempted to set forth in an article on "The Preëxistence of Christ and (revised) Arianism" in *Religion and Culture*, Vol. II, Nos. 5 and 6 (May and Aug. 1920).

AN INTERPRETATION OF ISAIAH XL. 3

Wilderness and desert—words such as these fittingly describe the world which lay outside the borders of Israel. A moral waste it was for the most part: a region blighted by superstition, stunted in its religious growth, lacking adequate knowledge of God, where a constant struggle must be maintained to obtain the barest necessities for the spiritual life. The words wilderness and desert were also peculiarly apt to bring vividly to mind that inhospitable region where the people of God had once wandered for a generation, outside of the promised land, in sight of it, but not able to enter and take possession because of their sinful faithlessness, where they suffered hardship, and were beset by wild and murderous nomads who prowled about and slew and plundered the weak who lagged and those who strayed from the way, where the people languished for food and water, and must have perished had not God in his mercy by his good providence given them bread from heaven to eat and sweetened the brackish pool and opened the flinty rock that water might gush forth for them to drink. God found them in a desert land, and in the waste howling wilderness (Deut. xxxii. 19). And so a return to the wilderness early became an apt emblem for the loss of the promised land and an enforced sojourn among the nations of the world. The prophet Hosea declares that God will cause Israel to go into the wilderness because of its unfaithfulness to him (Hos. ii. 16, English 14; comp. xiii. 10, English 9); and Ezekiel calls the world outside of the promised land the wilderness of the nations (Ezek. xx. 35, xix. 13).¹ Yet wilderness and desert

¹ "Der Ausdruck ist vielmehr typisch, indem die zukünftige Führung Israels als eine Wiederholung der früheren Führung desselben aus Aegypten nach Canaan dargestellt ist, wie Hos. 2, 16" (Keil, *Commentar über den Propheten Ezechiel*, 2te Aufl., 1882). "Ezekiel (xx. 33-38) . . . is evidently a reminiscence of" Hos. ii. 14 (Cheyne, *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges: Hosea*, 1889). "Die Vorstellung . . . hat aber weiter gewirkt, bei Ezechiel (20:35) und in der späteren Eschatologie" (Wellhausen, *Die Kleinen Propheten*, 1898). Ézékiel, qui

were also words to conjure with. They spoke indeed of loneliness, desolation, danger, hardship, punishment for sin; but they spoke also of God's love for Israel even in its waywardness, and of his constant care of his people. Had he not found them of old in the wilderness, and kept them from destruction and at length brought them to their own land? (Deut. xxxii. 10-13). The history of the past opened a door of hope to Israel once more in the wilderness outside of the promised land and that land as of old under foreign domination (Hos. ii. 17, English 15).

In Isaiah xl. 3 these three ideas are apparently embodied in the prophet's reference to the wilderness and the desert.²

développe cette idée du retour au désert en un sens différent (xx. 34 s), paraît l'avoir empruntée à Osée" (van Hoonecker, *Les Douze Petits Prophètes*, 1908).

² The wilderness and desert have been understood to denote the desert which lies between Babylonia, where the exiles of Judah dwelt, and their native land of Palestine (Knobel). This interpretation assumes that the prophet is addressing only those scattered children of Zion who were in Babylonia. But no exegetical need in the chapter itself demands this limitation of the meaning; and such interpretation is too narrow, for the discourses to which the prophecy of Isa. xl. 1-11 forms the introduction have clearly in mind and explicitly announce the redemption of the people of God not only from Babylonia, but from all parts of the world. Interpreters, however, who adopt this explanation generally see in the wilderness and desert a figure of spiritual things also: thus Dillmann says, "Der Ausdruck aber ist, wie auch sonst oft bei diesem Profet, so gehalten, dass sich das höhere geistige Verständniss leicht anknüpft"; and more fully Bredenkamp, "Obwohl scharfe geographische Begrenzung wider den Geist dieser Prophetie ist, so ist doch wohl bei der Wüste an die zwischen Babel und Judäa gelegene zu denken, durch welche hin Jahve vor seinem Volke herzieht, um in Jerusalem sein Heil aufzurichten. Wie er einst durch die Wüste ziehend sein Volk erlöste, so auch jetzt wieder. Die Application der physischen Hindernisse auf das geistige Gebiet liegt nahe" (p. 233); and similarly Skinner, "The prophet seems to have expected the deliverance to issue in a triumphal progress of Jehovah with his people through the desert between Babylon and Palestine, after the analogy of the exodus from Egypt. But all such passages probably look beyond the material fulfilment and include the removal of political and other hindrances to the restoration of Israel" (*Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges: Isaiah*). Even in this revised form, however, justice is not done to the broad outlook of the prophet upon a worldwide re-

He is thinking and speaking of the world that lies outside the promised land: the world ruled by the nations, where Israel languished, deprived of its own inheritance and condemned to dreary sojourn in a country not its own, longing for the promised land, in sight of it at times, but debarred its possession because of sin; yet not forsaken of God and, having his promise, not without hope. That such is the breadth of the prophet's thought is reasonably inferred from the fact, namely that the situation of the people as depicted is the same as was foretold in an earlier prophecy it would be, and the words of the earlier prophecy are echoed in the later.³ The prophet Hosea had announced that as punishment for her sinful abandonment of God and

demption, in the discourses to which this opening prophecy is the recognized prologue.

Calvin exactly reverses this interpretation, and puts the whole emphasis on the figurative meaning. His words are: "The wilderness is employed to denote metaphorically that desolation which then existed; though I do not deny that the prophet alludes to the intermediate journey; for the roughness of the wilderness seemed to forbid their return [from Babylon]. He promises, therefore, that although every road were shut up, and not a chink were open, the Lord will easily cleave a path through the most impassable tracts for himself and his people." And Marti refuses to see anything but the figurative sense: "*Wüste und Steppe* sind nicht auf besondere Gegenden, die diese Namen *kat' exochen* trugen, etwa die Wüste Judas und die Steppe des Jordanthales, zu deuten, sondern gehören zum ganzen Bilde: Wo bis jetzt kein Weg war, wird ein Jahveweg gebahnt, bereitet die neue Zeit sich wunderbar vor."

But Isa. xl. 1-3 may contain a reminiscence of Hos. ii. 16. If so, the wilderness does not signify merely a pathless waste, a region of utter desolation, but certain definite associations cluster about it, derived from the earlier prophecy.

³ "Ganz so wie Hos. 2: 16 und vielleicht nicht ohne Erinnerung an diese ältere Weissagung" (Delitzsch, *Commentar über den Propheten Jesaia*, 1866) see Stier, *Jesaias, nicht Pseudo-Jesaias*, 1851). "Ganz im selben Zusammenhang Hos. 2: 16, wo der Herr wieder um die Liebe seines Volkes wirbt" (von Orelli, *Die Propheten Jesaia und Jeremia*, 1887). "How beautifully the promise [in Hosea's prophecy] anticipates the great promise of Israel's restoration, which opens, remarkably enough, with the very phrase used by Hosea, 'Speak ye to the heart of Jerusalem'" (Cheyne, *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges: Hosea*, 1889).

shameful dalliance with heathen deities God would bring faithless Israel into the wilderness, and would speak to her heart, and open for her thence a door of hope, and bring her back to her home and her God (Hos. ii. 16 f).⁴ Even so, in the later prophecy, God comes to the people with "a promise of deliverance from exile,"⁵ saying, Speak ye to the heart of Jerusalem, and say unto her that her warfare is accomplished and her iniquity pardoned; and forthwith the voice of the herald is heard, crying, In the wilderness prepare ye the way of the Lord (who is coming to save) and his glory shall be revealed. The situation is the same in the two prophecies. The people of God, in punishment for their shameful infidelity to Jehovah, have lost their possession of the promised land, and the bulk of them are scattered among the nations. Israel is indeed in the wilderness, as it is called by Hosea; living, as pictured in Deuteronomy, a life of want in contrast to the abundance of Canaan (Deut. xxviii. 47 f). In the promise to Jerusalem of the deliverance of her exiles, a voice cries, In the wilderness prepare ye the way of the Lord. If the later prophet has the earlier prophecy of Hosea in mind, and the similarity in the situation lends probability to the opinion that he has, then it is natural to conclude that he too means by wilderness the world of the nations.

The wording employed in both prophecies strengthens the evidence afforded by the similarity of situation. The expression "speak comfortably" (literally, to the heart), is a form of words used with some frequency elsewhere, but not again in these last twenty-seven chapters of the book of Isaiah. Though the purpose of the prophet in these chapters is to offer comfort, and the idea of comfort is expressed in words not less than fourteen times, yet the expression "speak to the heart" is employed in the introductory discourse only. Why? Probably because the prophecy of

⁴ English 14 f; note "cause to go" and "thence"; comp. iii. 2-5.

⁵ "The book . . . opened with a promise of deliverance from exile" (Alexander, *The Later Prophecies of Isaiah*, p. 152); exile, but not exclusively the exile of the Jews in Babylonia (comp. p. 1).

Hosea gives shape to his thought, even as an early event in Israel's history may have influenced Hosea's mind. In early days, soon after the settlement of Israel in Canaan, a Levite's concubine proved unfaithful to him, and went away from him; and her husband went after her to speak to her heart and bring her again (Judg. xix. 1-3; referred to in Hos. ix. 9, x. 9). And Israel of the north, like a faithless wife, as the prophet points out, has been untrue to Jehovah her lord, and he will make her go into the wilderness; but he will speak to her heart there, and bring her thence, and restore her to the blessings she had formerly enjoyed (Hos. ii. 16-22). And now not Israel of the north only, but Judah as well, have proved unfaithful (Isa. i. 21, lvii. 3, 7-9), and have been banished, sent into exile; but at length the voice of God is heard, saying, Speak ye to the heart of Jerusalem, and say to her that her iniquity is pardoned and her restoration is at hand. The prophet seems to have the words of his predecessor Hosea in mind. Language and situation are the same in the two prophecies. It is reasonable to conclude their kinship, and that the later prophet uses wilderness in a sense similar to, though wider than, that of his predecessor, to denote the world of nations, the region to which God in judgment has brought his unfaithful people for discipline before he speaks words of comfort to them; a desert that surrounded the land of Israel, and at times broke across the border and spread its desolation over the promised inheritance (comp. Isa. v. 4-6).

To the eye of the prophet this wilderness extends to earth's remotest bounds. Hosea had foreseen the enforced migration of the northern Israelites from their homes, their scattering among the towns of Egypt and Assyria (Hos. ix. 3, 6, x. 6, xi. 5, 11), and their wandering among the nations (ix. 17). Isaiah the son of Amoz had foretold the captivity of Judah (Isa. iii. 24, v. 13, 26-30, vi. 11 f); he had spoken in the presence of king Hezekiah of exile in Babylonia (Isa. xxxix. 5-7); and his range of vision, in a

prophecy much misunderstood,⁶ extended beyond Egypt, Assyria, and Babylonia, far beyond the remotest communities of exiled Israelites at any period before the great days of Rome. He foresaw exiles in all parts of the world, even at the ends of the earth, on the shores of the world ocean (Isa. xi, 11-16). In the book of Deuteronomy, also, at chapter xxviii. 64, a passage which is commonly held by criticism both conservative and radical to antedate Isa. xl-lxvi, the people of Israel are forewarned that if they are disobedient, Jehovah will scatter them "among all peoples, from the one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth." In the last twenty-seven chapters of the book of Isaiah the prophet has this wide view. He speaks of the exiles in Babylonia indeed, explicitly however only in the first nine of these chapters, and he foretells their return. But his gaze sweeps the world. And that, too, at the very beginning, in these first nine chapters; for while he looks upon Israel and sees them despoiled because they have sinned against Jehovah, he also beholds them redeemed, and hears Jehovah's promise that he will be with them, and the deep waters through which they must pass shall not overflow them neither shall the fire kindle upon them; for he, Jehovah their saviour, is with them, and will recover their offspring and gather them from the north and the south and the east and the west, even from afar, from the end of the earth (Isa. xlii. 23-xliii. 7). The deliverance from Babylon is but the first streak of day in the eastern sky. It betokens the dawn of the great day of ingathering, the "day of salvation," when from all parts of the world the sons and daughters of Zion, every one that is called by Jehovah's name, redeemed of the Lord, shall come with singing unto Zion (Isa. xliii. 5, xlix. 8, 12, 22, comp. verses 14-26, lx. 4, 9, lxvi. 19, 20).

The herald is heard, calling his summons to prepare in the wilderness a highway for Jehovah. The herald's cry means more than that the advent of the Lord is at hand.

⁶ See this REVIEW, 1916, p. 666.

It is the king's command to prepare the road. It is imperative, it brooks neither neglect nor refusal to obey. The road whithersoever the Lord will come must be put in order without fail. It is fitting that it should be, and it is required to be. Every hindrance and all that is unsightly must be removed. Every spiritual obstacle in the hearts and lives of his people must be taken away, what is crooked in conduct must be made straight, what is unclean, must be put away. The highway shall be called the way of holiness (Isa. xxxv. 8). And are we not right in understanding that this is the herald's voice as he starts on his mission? The stages of a royal journey, it seems, are marked in this prophetic drama, unfolded in chapter xl. 1-11. First, the herald's voice is heard, summoning men to prepare a way in the wilderness for Jehovah; and at last from the mountain tops of the holy land men of faith behold God their king within their borders and marching onward to assume his throne in Zion. The starting point is the wilderness, and as Jehovah moves onward in redemption, according to invariable custom the herald goes before, and his call is heard all along the route in advance of the king (Gen xli. 43, Esth. vi. 11). In the drama unfolded in these verses the herald leaves the stage, indeed, and his cry is not heard there again; but the audience of the prophet understands: as Jehovah moves forward in his triumphal progress, the herald goes before his king with the summons to prepare the way. His call is heard in the desert where the royal progress begins; it will be heard ever before him as the Lord advances, as he draws nigh Jerusalem, as he enters the temple, his dwelling place, the house of the kingdom (Mal. iii. 1). And if the day of redemption is long and the king's progress slow, at the several stages of the journey herald may be replaced by herald and a new voice be heard uttering the old familiar cry.

The day of redemption dawned with the return from Babylon. A splendor all its own burst forth when the Lord came to his temple. The king has not now an official resi-

dence on earth, whither the tribes go up. But the need ceases for Zion's children to migrate to Palestine in order to be within the borders of the kingdom; for, according to the promise, he shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the River unto the ends of the earth (Ps. lxxii. 8, Zech. ix. 10, Rev. xi. 15). The kingdom becomes world-wide, and the wilderness disappears.

Princeton.

JOHN D. DAVIS.

THE NAME JOSEPH

A good example of the difficulties which the critics, who reject the testimony of the documents of the Old Testament, encounter in their efforts to rewrite history is found in Professor Barton's recent discussion¹ of the name Joseph. Despite the marked difference between the "Table of Nations" (Gen. x) and the "narratives of the patriarchs"—the strikingly individual and personal character of the latter—he argues that we are "on safe historical ground, if we assume that at least a part of the patriarchal narratives consists of tribal history narrated as the experiences of individual men".² After arguing this briefly in behalf of the Leah and Rachel "clans," he proceeds:³

"Similarly, the name Joseph seems to have been attached to the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh after the settlement in Canaan. The name itself has had an interesting history. A Babylonian business document of the time of the first dynasty of Babylon (2225-1926 B.C.) had for one of its witnesses *Yashub-ilu*,⁴ or Joseph-el. Thothmes III, who conquered Palestine and Syria between 1478 and 1447 B.C., records as one of the places which he conquered in Palestine *Wa-sha-p'-ra*,⁵ which Eduard Meyer many years ago recognized as Joseph-el. This equivalence is doubted by W. Max Müller, but is, so far as I can see, possible. How did the name of a Babylonian man become attached to a Palestinian city? There was at the time of the first dynasty frequent intercourse between Mesopotamia and Palestine. Documentary evidence of this will be cited below in connection with Abraham. Is it too much to imagine

¹ *The Religion of Israel* (1918), p. 27 f. For a review of this book, see pp. 673 f.

² P. 25.

³ P. 27 f.

⁴ "Cuniform Texts, etc., in the British Museum, II, no. 23, l. 15."

⁵ "Mittheilung der Vorderasiatische Gesellschaft, 1907, p. 28. Müller thinks it equivalent to *Yesheb-el*, "God dwells." The Babylonian might also be so interpreted. The phonetic equivalence between Babylonian and Hebrew points rather to *Joseph-el*, and the Babylonian form may account for the Egyptian spelling, which forms the basis of Müller's doubt."

that Joseph-el migrated, and that his name became attached to a Palestinian city? Not only have we in our own country many places named for men, but modern Palestine affords an example of a village that lost during the nineteenth century its name, *Karyet el-'Ineb*, and substituted for it the name of a famous sheik, *Abu Ghosh*.⁶ If in some such way Joseph-el made its way into Palestine, becoming the name of a city and Rachel tribes afterwards settled in the region, the shortened form of the name, Joseph, might naturally become the name of their supposed ancestor.

"The principle of interpretation gained from Genesis 10 compels us to suppose that the name Joseph came in in some such way, for in the historical period no tribe of Joseph appears. If the investigator is forced to this conclusion, how are the vivid narratives of the personal fortunes of Joseph to be accounted for?"

We are not concerned to discuss all the points which emerge in this argument as quoted. Our main interest centers about Dr. Barton's assertion that *Yashub-ilu* or Joseph-el is the name of "a Babylonian man" who may conceivably have migrated to Palestine and given his name to a Palestinian city and that we are compelled to suppose "that the name Joseph came in in some such way" and not in the way which the Old Testament relates, as the significant name given by Rachel to her first born son.

There are two points to be considered: Was *Yashub-ilu* a Babylonian man? Is there any warrant for connecting him with Joseph?

WAS YASHUB-ILU A BABYLONIAN?

By the words "Babylonian man" we understand, native Babylonian. This seems clearly to be Dr. Barton's meaning. For he speaks of the "frequent intercourse between Mesopotamia and Palestine" at this period and of Joseph-el as *migrating* and his name becoming "attached to a Palestinian city."⁷

⁶ "See Baedeker's *Palästina*, Leipzig, 1910, p. 16."

⁷ On the other hand on p. 40 he tells us that the patriarchal narratives "portray certain tribal and historical facts, which they have

In considering this question it should be noted in the first place that the occurrence of the name *Yashub-ilu* on a Babylonian tablet found at or near Sippar in Northern Babylonia and belonging apparently—it is undated—to the time of the First Dynasty of Babylon (cir. 2000 B.C.) does not prove that the bearer of the name was a native Babylonian. On documents of all periods we find the names of many foreigners. And on those of the First Dynasty so many West Semitic⁸ names occur, even among the names of the kings themselves, that scholars have been inclined to speak of an "Amorite invasion" and of this dynasty as an Amorite (i.e. West Semitic) dynasty.⁹ Consequently, the fact that his name appears on a Babylonian tablet does not prove *Yashub-ilu* to be a "Babylonian man."

It is to be noted in the second place that this *Yashub-ilu* is not a witness, as Dr. Barton states, but a slave. The document records the "gift" (*niditi*) of 3 tracts of land (aggregating about 100 acres), 26 slaves (13 male and 13 female; the women, two of whom are stated to have children, being probably the wives of the men), 8 cows, 4 oxen, and 60 sheep. The name of the donor is partly effaced; the recip-

grouped around the names of certain famous Amorites who once migrated into Palestine and gave their names to certain of its localities." If this "Babylonian man" or another of whom he is a type is really a "famous Amorite," Dr. Barton is certainly using language in a loose and confusing way.

⁸ "Masses of foreign names are found in all periods, the study of which is so important for the correct understanding of the movements of people, due to persecution or captivity, or to the fact that at the time the ruling dynasty was foreign. The tablets of the Hammurabi era contain many West Semitic names of the Arabic, Aramaic and Hebrew types" (A. T. Clay, on "Names (Babylonian)" in Hastings' *Encyc. of Religion and Ethics*). Chiera remarks, "We are not surprised to find on the same tablet names written in Akkadian [i.e., Semitic Babylonian], Sumerian or even in foreign languages" (Publications of the Bab. Section of the Univ. of Penna. Museum XI, 1, p. 15.).

⁹ The general name given to these foreigners seems to have been, as Ranke points out, "children of the Westland" (*mârê Amurru*). Sayce regards the Amorites (*Amurrû*) as "the dominant people in western Asia" in the time of Abraham (*Internat. Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, p. 119a).

ient of the gift is not stated. *Yashub-ilu* is the name of the 9th of the male slaves.¹⁰ In view of the fact that slaves in Babylonia (as in Israel) might be foreigners sold into slavery (as Joseph to the Midianites) or captured in war, as well as natives of the country, the fact that the *Yashub-ilu* named on this document is a slave—this is all we know about him except his name—leaves it still an open question whether or not he was a native Babylonian.

We turn then to the name itself, *Yashub-ilu*, as the only remaining factor in the investigation. It is of especial interest not merely in view of the meagre and inconclusive information we have thus far obtained, but also because of its definite and almost decisive bearing upon the question under discussion. The most noticeable thing about it is that, except for the *ilu* (Heb. *el*, God), it is identical with *Jashub*¹¹ the name given in the Old Testament to one of the sons of Issachar;¹² and that it resembles in form the names, *Jagur**, *Janum**, *Janoah** (*Yanuh*), *Jair* (or *Jaor*, Heb. יעיר), *Jalon*, *Jadon*; cf., *Jair* (יאר), *Jabin*, *Jachin*, *Jakim* and *Jarib*.¹³ Most, perhaps all, of these names are quite probably to be regarded as imperfects (or jussives) of the *Ayin Waw* or *Ayin Yodh* verb. Thus *Jakim* means "he will lift up, or establish," *Jarib*, "he will contend." *Joseph*, "may be add," is from a *Pe Waw* verb (note the

¹⁰ The wife of *Yashub-ilu* is perhaps the *Akiyatum*, whose name is given 7th in the list of women, at least her name shows indication of being a West Semitic name. If so, the names are not given in corresponding order in the two lists.

¹¹ Or *Yashub*. The consonantal *y* (as in *yet*) is not correctly reproduced by *j* (*dzh*) of the modern English. *Jashub* (AV orthography) should be pronounced *Yashub*. All the Hebrew or West Semitic proper names cited in this discussion begin (unless otherwise stated) with *y*. But where the form familiar to the English reader is given, e.g., *Jacob*, *Igal*, *Joseph*, *Ibhar*, etc., the usual spelling is retained.

¹² Numb. xxvi. 24; Ezra x. 29; 1 Chron. vii. 1 has *Yashib* as the *Kethubh*. In Gen. xlv. 13 the name is given as *Job* (יוב); but this reading is not supported by the LXX.

¹³ Names marked with asterisk (*) are place names, which sometimes do not differ essentially from personal names and may even be identical with them.

form (יהופת) Japhet, "may he enlarge," from a *Lamedh Hê*, as is also Jephunneh. Similar examples for the strong verb (including the gutturals) are Jacob, Jephthah, Igal, Ibhar, Isaac (יצחק), Izhar, Jamlech, Japhlet.

Names containing the imperfect of the verb may appear without a subject expressed, as in the instances just cited, or with such a subject. In the latter case they are usually theophoric (containing a divine name, which is usually God (*el*) or Jehovah). The subject may follow as in the case of *Yashub-ilu*: cf. Israel, Ishmael, Irpeel*, Jeziel, Jezeel, Ezekiel, Jahaziah, Josiah, Ishaiah, Ishmaiah. Or the subject may precede as in Eliakim, Eliashib, Jehoiachin, Jehoiakim. It is probable that the shorter names are frequently, perhaps generally, to be regarded as shortened forms of the theophoric. Thus we find Josiphiah, "may Jehovah add," and Joseph, "may he add," Izhariah and Izhar, Jiphthah-el* and Jiphthah* (in the Hebrew, the same as Jephthah). This justifies us in regarding *Yashub-ilu* or *Jashub-el* as merely the longer, theophoric, form of *Jashub*. Sometimes, however, the subject is not a theophoric name. Jeroboam probably means "the people increases," cf. the names Jeshobeam, "the people will return,"¹⁴ and the significant name Shear-jashub "a remnant shall return." The last two names contain the word *Jashub* in combination¹⁵ and confirm the view that *Jashub* may be merely short for *Jashub-el*.

¹⁴ -am (עם) which was formerly interpreted as the common word for "people," may also mean "uncle," or "kinsman." That in certain of the Old Testament names containing this element it should be so rendered seems not improbable. But it is certain that in some at least, e.g., the significant names Ammi, Lo-ammi, the meaning "people" is the correct one. And while this name might be rendered "(my) kinsman will be gracious," the old rendering "the people will return" or "let the people return" seems preferable.

¹⁵ The name Jeshobi-lehem apparently also contains the element *Jashub*. But its form and meaning are not at all certain. *Jushab-hesed* may be a Hophal from this root, "may loving-kindness be renewed." Compare the name Judah, "may he be praised," which is clearly treated in Gen. xxix. 35, xlix. 8 as a Hophal form. For the uncontracted form יהוה we have a parallel in the writing of Jehoseph for Joseph, cited above.

In view of the claim that *Yashub-ilu* is the name of a Babylonian, this close resemblance between this name and other West Semitic or Old Testament names is certainly noteworthy. But this is not the only striking thing about it. Equally remarkable is the marked difference between it and genuine Babylonian names. The clearest mark of differentiation is, perhaps, the fact that the word *yashub* begins with a consonantal *y*. This is distinctive because in the Babylonian, unlike the other principal Semitic languages (Arabic, Aramaic, Hebrew), the rule that the syllable must begin with a consonant is not strictly observed. This is due to the fact that in Babylonian the semi-vowels (*w* and *y*) and most of the gutturals are much weaker than in these other languages, and tend to disappear. The tendency of *aleph* to quiesce and of *waw* and *yodh* to contract or be dropped is of course familiar to every student of Hebrew. But in Hebrew this tendency—with one exception, the conjunction *waw* (and)—never affects the general rule just referred to, that a syllable cannot begin with a vowel. In forms like *אֶקַּט* (I will kill), *יֶקַּט* (he will kill) the *aleph* and *yodh* retain their full consonantal force; and *waw* at the beginning of the word is changed to *yodh* (e.g., *wa-shab* becomes *yashab*). In Babylonian, on the other hand, this is not the case. The *w*¹⁶ and *y* (and all but the strongest of the gutturals) regularly contract or are dropped at the beginning of the word, which consequently begins with a vowel. Thus *yik̄tol* (Heb.; from *yak̄tul*) would appear in Babylonian as *ik̄tul*, the *yi* (*ya*) becoming *i*; and in the case of the *Ayin-Waw* verb the Babylonian equivalent of *yashub* would be *ishub*, as is proved by such forms as *idûk*, *ikûn*, *imût*, *itûr*, etc.¹⁷ Other examples might be cited, but this loss

¹⁶ In the case of the *w* we can trace this process to a considerable extent. In documents of this period (the First Dynasty), we frequently find words beginning with *waw*: e.g., in the Code of Hammurabi we find *wardum* (later *ardu*), *warkum* (later *arku*), *kima abim walidim* (later *alidi*), etc.

¹⁷ It should be noted that the tense-system differs in Babylonian considerably from that of the other Semitic languages. The West Semitic

of the initial consonant and the frequent and regular occurrence of words beginning with the vowel is so characteristic of Babylonian that it does not require extended proof. Hence, one of the noticeable peculiarities of the El Amarna Letters, written in Babylonian by Syrian and Palestinian rulers and officials who probably spoke Canaanite and whose mastery of the Babylonian language was far from perfect, is the occurrence of a number of verbal forms which begin with *y*—forms like *yikṭul* or *yakṭul* instead of *ikṭul*. Such forms are recognized as due to West Semitic (Canaanite) influence and some of them may be explained as genuine Canaanite.¹⁸ Consequently, the fact that the name *Yashub-ilu* begins with a consonantal *y* at once arrests attention.

It is not surprising then that Ranke, one of the pioneers in the study of Babylonian personal names, in giving a sample list of names contained on cuneiform tablets of this period, which while of Semitic origin "differ essentially from the genuine Babylonian names,"¹⁹ included several beginning with *ya*, *Yashubum* being one of the number.²⁰ That names of this type are not Babylonian, but West Semitic, is now

perfect (*kaṭal*) was not used, the intransitive forms (*kaṭil* and *kaṭul*) being used only in a stative or permansive sense, and instead of one these with the *preformative* (as in Hebrew *yikṭol*) the Babylonian developed two (*ikṭul* and *ikṭal*) using the one as a preterite and the other as a present or future. Consequently, while *ikṭul* in Babylonian corresponds in form most closely to *yikṭol* the two being probably originally the same, in meaning it has come to be used as a preterite. Thus to Nathanael (*Nathan* + *el*, God has given, or gives) corresponds *Iddina* (= ידן) + *ilu* in Babylonia.

¹⁸ Cf. Ebeling, *Das Verbum der El-Amarna-Briefe*, p. 46 f.

¹⁹ *Early Babylonian Personal Names* (1905), p. 24 ff.

²⁰ *Yashubum* Ranke regards as "abbreviated from a name like *Yashub-ilu*" (he cites the tablet referred to by Dr. Barton). He also mentions *yashub* as a verbal form characteristic of this non-Babylonian group of names, and in the more detailed discussion which follows he gives *Yashubum* among the "parallels" to these names which can be found "in the Aramaic and Canaanitish provinces," referring to *Baal-yashub*, son of *Yakin-lu*, king of Arvad, mentioned in Assurbanipal's Annals, and the names *Shubna-ilu* and *Shubunu-Yama* (p. 30), the former a name found in the early, the latter in the late, period, all of which contain the same root.

generally admitted. Chiera²¹ has recently published a tablet containing a long list of personal names, which he designates as Amorite (i.e., West Semitic, as distinguished from Babylonian) and a number of which he has identified with names occurring in the Old Testament. It is noteworthy that about 75 of these names begin with *ya*.²²

Let us now look at the second part of the name *Yashub-ilu*. We have seen that *el*, i.e., *ilu*, frequently occurs as an element in Old Testament names. Consequently, the fact that we find it in the name under discussion may be regarded as favoring the view that the name *Yashub-ilu* is West Semitic. This is true. But the fact that *ilu* is often found in genuine Babylonian names, and is quite frequent in names of this period, of course makes it impossible to attach importance to this, save as it is confirmed by other evidence. It is, therefore, important to notice that another theophoric element which is more distinctively West Semitic than *ilu*—the name of the god Dagan,²³ which is met with quite frequently in West Semitic names—occurs in combination with the element *yashub*. We find the name *Yashub-dagan* on

²¹ *Lists of Personal Names from the Temple School of Nippur* (1916), published as Vol. XI, No. 2, of the Publications of the Babylonian Section of the University of Penna. Museum, cf. especially p. 111 ff. and 118 ff.

²² The tablet, a large one originally, is badly mutilated, only fragments remaining. According to Chiera it must have contained about 400 names.

²³ Ranke in speaking of names of this character remarks: "The names of Babylonian deities are very rarely found in this group of names. In their place we find only Dagan and, once, Ishtara." This statement made some 15 years ago and intended apparently to refer primarily to the group of names just referred to needs to be somewhat modified. Thus Adad (Hadad) is found in West Semitic names (cf. p. 654). With regard to Dagan it should be noted that his name appears very early in Babylonia: in a name on the obelisk of Manishtu-su, in the date list of Dungi, in the names of Idin-Dagan and Isme-Dagan of the dynasty of Isin, in the prologue to the Code of Hammurabi, etc. But that he was originally a West Semitic deity, the same as Dagon, is quite generally recognized, e.g., by Clay, Ed. Meyer, Ranke, Tallquist, Langdon, Chiera.

two tablets of this period.²⁴ On the first of these *Yashub-dagan* is named first in a list of 15 men and women, one or two of whom are apparently designated as Amorites. At the close there is a reference to 15 garments of some kind; the document is probably the record of a gift or votive offering. The other tablet comes from Ḫana and is dated in the reign of the Kassite king, Kashtiliash. It records the sale of a field in Tirka, the capital of Ḫana, and mentions *Yashmah-dagan, son of Yashub-dagan*, as one of the numerous witnesses. A number of the names on this tablet are clearly West Semitic, viz., *Abihel* (Heb., Abihail), *Binammi* (Ben-ammi Gen. xix. 36), *Yarib-adad*, *Yakun-adad*, *Yakun-ammu*, *Yakumu*, *Yasu-adad*, *Izrah-dagan*, *Yadih-el*; probably also *Ibal-dagan*, *Ibalum*. It has long been recognized on the testimony of names like these that Ḫana must have had a very large West Semitic element in its population.²⁵ And to find a name containing this element among other West Semitic names at Ḫana favors our contention that it is non-Babylonian.

The same applies to the name *Yashubum* which, as has been pointed out, is probably the hypocoristic or abbreviated form "of a name like *Yashub-ilu*." It occurs on two tablets of the First Dynasty.²⁶ One of these tablets deals with the sale of real estate; and *Yashubum*, son of *Iziashar* (probably a West Semitic name), is one of the witnesses of the transaction. The other tablet deals with a gift of land with water rights; and *Yashubum*, is named as the donor. The father of one of the witnesses is named *Ḫabdum*, which is clearly a West Semitic name (cf. the name *Ebed*, עֶבֶד).

Besides the imperfect, *yashub*, we also find the imperative, *shub*, as an element in personal names. It occurs in the name *Shubna-ilu* (cf. the Biblical name Shubael). It is noteworthy that this man whose name appears here as a

²⁴ Cf. Thureau-Dangin, *Letters et Contrats de l'époque de la Première Dynastie Babylonienne*, Nos. 109 and 238.

²⁵ Cf. A. T. Clay, *History of the Amorites* (1919).

²⁶ Cf. *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, IV 49b and 16 resp.

witness is stated to have a brother *Yadah-ilu* and that their father is called *Yakub-ilu*, both of them West Semitic names. The name *Shubiya* is also found. Ranke regards it as the diminutive of *Yashubum* and compares it with the Hebrew name *Shobai*.²⁷

As to the *meaning* of the Hebrew name *Jashub*, it is obvious that it comes from the root שׁוּב, "to turn back, return." In this name it is probably used in the sense of "return (to show favor)," cf. Gen. xviii. 10: He (God, or Jehovah) will (or, may he) again be gracious. Or it may be better to connect it with *Jeshobeam* (the people will return [unto their God]) and render, "may he return." The verb is of frequent occurrence in Hebrew and is also used in Arabic and Aramaic. The root apparently does not occur in Babylonian. The same idea, however, is expressed by the root *târu* which occurs in several different forms and combinations, *Itâr*, *Itûr*, *Ituram*, *Litûr*, etc., and by the root *rânu*, in such forms as *Rîm*, *Rimanni*, *Turâm*, etc. This makes it still more difficult to regard the name *Yashub-ilu* as a Babylonian name. No satisfactory etymology can be given for it. Dr. Barton cites Müller's rendering of *Wa-sha-p'-ra*²⁸ "God dwells" and says, "The Babylonian might also be so interpreted." But he does not favor this explanation, which is rendered precarious by the fact that the Babylonian verb *ashābu* ("to dwell"; Heb. יָשַׁב) has no such form as *yashub* and further is of rare occurrence as an element in Babylonian proper names. Yet Dr. Barton does not tell us what *Yashub-ilu* would mean as a Babylonian name.

Since, then, we are almost wholly dependent upon the name for any clue which is to be gathered as to the nationality of *Yashub-ilu*, it is significant that the data at our disposal show about as clearly as could be expected under the circumstances that the bearer of this name was a non-Babylonian. It is of course impossible to be certain about

²⁷ Cf. Ranke, *Personal Names*, pp. 30 and 151.

²⁸ *-ra* would then be understood as the Egyptian equivalent of *ilu*, *Ra* being the name of one of the chief gods of Egypt.

this. We find instances where the children of foreigners have Babylonian names. Thus *Yakub-ilu* (Jacob-el?) of the time of Hammurabi had a son *Sin-eribam*. And it is of course possible that a native Babylonian might for one of many reasons give a non-Babylonian name to his child. But in the absence of definite evidence to the contrary, the fact that the name can be shown to be a foreign name should be accepted as proof that the bearer of the name cannot correctly be called a "Babylonian man."

JOSEPH AND YASHUB-ILU

We pass on now to consider whether there is any connection between Joseph and *Yashub-ilu*.

Joseph, according to the narrative in Genesis xxx, means "may he add" (Hiphil jussive from יָשַׁב)—"And she called his name Joseph; and she said, The Lord shall add to me another son." As in the case of several other names in this passage the appropriateness of the name is due in part at least to the similarity in sound between the two verbs יָסַף "to collect" (and hence, "to take away") and יָשַׁב "to add"—"and she said God hath taken away (*'asaph*) my reproach: And she called his name Joseph (*yoseph*, may he add) saying," etc. That the name Joseph also occurred in a longer form is shown, as has been stated above, by the name Josiphiah "Jehovah will add" found in Ezra viii. 10. The critics will doubtless assure us—they have often done so—that this account of the naming of the patriarch is purely fictitious. Dr. Barton finds, it is true, much in the story of Joseph which is corroborated by external (Egyptian) sources. But this does not lead him to accept the Old Testament account of the historic Joseph, much less to accept the name incident. Yet this incident accords strikingly with the facts at our disposal. The desire for a numerous progeny was characteristic of the ancient Semites. It finds expression for example in the prayers of the Babylonian and Assyrian kings. Thus Nebuchadnezzar repeatedly asks for the blessing of fruitfulness: "May I be satisfied with, have

abundance of, children (descendants)" or similar expressions. Conversely a most grievous curse is the one which invokes "childlessness" upon a man. Such a curse Hammurabi invokes in the conclusion of his "Code" upon any king among his successors who shall fail to observe it. In these respects the Hebrews and Babylonians had very similar views.

Hence it is natural that among the Babylonians and Assyrians we have many names which express this desire in one form or another. The one most familiar to Bible students is Sennacherib (*Sin-ahê-eriba*). If this means, "O God Sin, multiply brethren," then *Eribam* or *Erba*, "increase (for me)"—the shorter form of this and similar names—may be regarded as a close equivalent of the name Joseph. If, however, *eriba* is a preterite instead of an imperative—both explanations seem to be certainly possible—Sennacherib would mean "Sin has multiplied brethren," cf. the Hebrew name Eliasaph, "God has added" (אֱלִיָּסָף). In that case names such as *Ribam-ilu*, "give me increase, O god" *Rib-Nunu*, "give increase, O Nunu," *Lirib-Marduk*, "may Marduk (Merodach) give increase," which are clear examples of the wish form of the name in Babylonian, would be more strictly parallel to the name Joseph. In view of the peculiar circumstances in which, according to the Old Testament narrative, Rachel stood, the appropriateness of the name is perfectly obvious. And such archaeological facts as the ones just stated, are strong evidence of its correctness.

It should be noticed, however, that while Joseph is perfectly intelligible as a Hebrew name, and, as far as its meaning is concerned, strictly analogous to names found in Babylonian and Assyrian documents, it is just as difficult to account for it as a Babylonian name as we found it to be in the case of *Yashub*. Its form is just as characteristically West Semitic, and does not relate itself readily to any Babylonian root with which it might correspond etymologically and which would be appropriate as a personal name.

We have seen that *Yashub-ilu* is almost identical with

Jashub and that Jashub and Joseph are given in the Old Testament to entirely distinct persons, the one to a son of Issachar (and to several others also), the other to a half brother of Issachar (Joseph the son of Rachel), and that both show every indication, both in form and meaning, of being genuine Hebrew names and can only with difficulty if at all be accounted for as Babylonian words. It remains only to consider the question whether there is any connection between them. This may be confidently answered in the negative. Not merely does *Yashub-ilu* correspond so closely with Jashub that it may justly be accepted as practically the same word; it differs so much from Joseph that it cannot be proved that there is any connection between them. It must of course be recognized that *Yashub-ilu* can equally well be read *Yashup-ilu* (the word is spelled syllabically *Ya-shu-ub/p* in Babylonian, and the last sign can be read either *ub* or *up*) and also that a Babylonian *sh* might appear in Hebrew as *s*. Thus, in the name Shalmaneser (שלמנאסר, *Shulman-asharidu*) we have an example of *sh* rendered once by *sh* and once by *s* (ס); and despite the fact that in Babylonian the *sh* was stronger than in Assyrian, this change would be quite possible. But even then, it would be necessary, in view of the marked difference in the vowels, to assume that the name Joseph has been greatly "corrupted" if *Yoseph* is to be identified with *Yashup*. Over against this difficult hypothetical identification we have the simple explanation of the two names given above—an explanation which lies upon the surface of Scripture and which is confirmed by recently discovered facts.

Joseph and Jashub are both West Semitic names. The fact that the one has a strict analogy in Babylonian names of the First Dynasty and that the other appears as an element in several different names of the same period may justly be regarded as a confirmation of the Old Testament record. It certainly does not furnish any basis for the critic's conjectural rewriting of that record.

We have not forgotten of course that Dr. Barton nowhere

commits himself to the view that Joseph is to be identified with *Yashub-ilu*. In the passage quoted we find such expressions as: "possible," "might also be so interpreted," "Is it too much to imagine that," "If in some such way . . . might naturally become." But it is none the less clear that, like many others, Dr. Barton prefers a difficult hypothesis which conflicts with Scripture to a simple explanation which is in harmony with it. It is this attitude of patronizing superior wisdom assumed by the critics which is especially offensive to those who revere the Bible as the Word of God. And to find such views as the one we have been discussing, views which often lack any adequate basis and sometimes are in direct conflict with ascertained facts, put forth in a book intended for the "undergraduate" who is described as one who "wishes to know the truth as fully and frankly as it can be known" is distressing.

Princeton.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.

THE CHURCHMANSHIP OF WILLIAM HENRY ROBERTS

The service of the late Dr. Roberts to the cause of his Master was many sided. During his whole ministry he was a faithful and convincing preacher of the gospel. Evangelism was constantly on his mind and heart and he was interested in every movement directed towards the conversion of souls. He had the pastoral instinct and his annual reports to the General Assembly on Christian Life and Work revealed his close and sympathetic touch with all the problems of the parish. He loved to teach and every phase of Christian education challenged his attention and coöperation. The long list of books and pamphlets and reports of which he was the author or editor is an enduring monument to his literary taste and ability. He was a noble spirited citizen and patriot, and loyally supported any enterprise which served the betterment of the community and the welfare of the nation. His business training, knowledge of men and administrative talent admirably fitted him for the executive positions which he filled with marked efficiency. But Dr. Roberts was preëminently a churchman who loved and served the Church of Christ with an ardor and a diligence which few men in his generation have equalled.

One would naturally expect this as an outcome of his early training. He was a son of the manse. His father for fifty-eight years was a minister in the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church and was abundantly blessed in his labors for Christ. He had a record of more than five thousand converts won to Christ under his preaching. The son was justly proud of such a noble father and declared—"I am what I am from the human side because of what he did for me as a young man." His college training was in an institution affiliated with the Presbyterian Church, and the formative influence of home and college took such a strong hold upon him that although he turned aside for a few years to serve the State in the Treasury Department and the Congressional Library, the call of the Church was irresistible. Completing his

training for the ministry in "The Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church" at Princeton, he held a brief pastorate at Cranford, New Jersey, then became Librarian of Princeton Seminary and rendered a service of lasting value in organizing this important department of theological discipline when a new library building was occupied in the year 1879. This experience of nine years duration acquainted him with the literature of the Church and his service of seven years in the Chair of Practical Theology in Lane Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio, gave him the opportunity to study in detail the life and work of the Church in its claims upon the Christian ministry.

Meanwhile he had been elected to the office of Permanent Clerk of the General Assembly and when the office of Stated Clerk was vacated by the death of Dr. Hatfield, Dr. Roberts was elected to the position in 1884. It is interesting to note that Dr. Hatfield died, as did Dr. Roberts, at the age of seventy-six, and counting his service in the New School Assembly, he filled the office of Stated Clerk for thirty-seven years, surpassing Dr. Roberts' term by one year. This office gave Dr. Roberts points of contact with every phase of church life and activity, and with his organizing instinct, talent for details and zeal for the mastery of any subject or problem which confronted him, he became in time a veritable ecclesiastical encyclopedia. Back of his authoritative knowledge of matters pertaining to organized Christianity, was his deep interest in and loyal devotion to the Church which he served. It may be remarked that the deliberations of Church courts are not always electric and to sit through the prolonged sessions of Boards and Committees whose number is legion requires a store of grace and patience which souls only of rare endowment can accumulate. Those who were intimately associated with Dr. Roberts will testify that on no occasion did he ever display lack of interest in any fact, figure or fancy that had any bearing upon the work of the Church. It was his meat and his drink to consider and discuss the affairs of all churches in general and of his own church in particular.

His pride in the history, the doctrine, government, worship and service of the Presbyterian Church was not obscured by any bushel. Whatever claim any church might make as to preëminence could be challenged by Dr. Roberts with a counter and superior claim of Presbyterianism. He resented the assumption that Congregationalism alone can claim descent from the Pilgrim fathers and insisted that Presbyterians in their doctrine, polity and worship have a closer kinship with the founders of the New England Colonies than any other American Christians. His authorship was almost wholly along denominational lines, and he has placed Presbyterians under obligations which cannot be measured by the material which he has gathered and put into useful shape, bearing upon the Constitution of our Church. Believing that the Reformed Theology and the Presbyterian System have a special mission in world redemption, he deplored the divisions among those churches which claim Calvin as their spiritual progenitor, and to bring about closer relations he gave unreservedly his best energies. The Alliance of Reformed Churches throughout the world holding the Presbyterian System was to his mind a great forward step in the direction of organic union, and through the Council of the Reformed Churches in America holding the Presbyterian System, he hoped for such a co-operation among kindred Calvinistic churches as would greatly advance the interests of Christian Unity and of the Kingdom of Christ.

In 1903 when the Assembly appointed a Committee on Church Coöperation and Union he was made the Chairman and with unflinching tact and judgment, with whole-hearted interest and self-denying effort through the intervening years he has faithfully endeavored to promote the expressed desire of the Assembly for a closer "coöperation, confederation and consolidation with other churches." It was largely through his leadership that the Cumberland Presbyterian Church was reunited with the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. One of the most impressive scenes ever witnessed

in any of our Assembly meetings was the one at Philadelphia when the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church came as a body into the membership of the Presbyterian Church. Referring to this union Dr. Roberts, a few days afterwards, testified, "It was the crown of my life for which I shall always thank God alike in earth and heaven."

One would hardly expect such a devout Presbyterian to advocate union with churches other than those belonging to the Calvinistic group. But, acting under the instructions of our highest court—the Assembly—Dr. Roberts has been a zealous advocate and promoter of coöperation among all evangelical churches. He took a prominent part in the organization of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. For a number of years he was Chairman of its Executive Committee, and also Chairman of its Committee on Evangelism, and up to the time of his death he was a member of its Administrative Committee. When the Protestant Episcopal Church proposed a World Conference on Faith and Order Dr. Roberts led the Assembly to a most sympathetic response and in all the preliminary conferences held in America Dr. Roberts was recognized as an outstanding figure among the non-episcopal churches whose wide acquaintance, expert knowledge of religious conditions at home and abroad and well-balanced judgment, made him an indispensable counsellor. He had hoped to attend the Preliminary Conference at Geneva, but failing health compelled him with great reluctance to abandon the idea.

The Assembly at its meeting in Columbus two years ago received a large number of overtures dealing with a proposed union of all evangelical churches in the United States. In answer to these overtures and upon the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Bills and Overtures the Assembly unanimously and by a rising vote took the following action:

"We do declare and place on record our profound conviction that the time has come for Organic Church Union of the Evangelical Churches of America.

"This Assembly overtures the National Bodies of the

Evangelical Communities of America to meet with our representatives for the purpose of formulating a Plan of Organic Union."

The Assembly's Committee on Church Coöperation and Union "is authorized and directed to designate a place and time, not later than January 1, 1919, for the above named convention: to prepare a suitable invitation; to fix the ratio of representation; and appoint the delegates of our Body, to prepare a tentative plan of Organic Union for presentation and to attend to all necessary arrangements."

Whatever views Dr. Roberts may have personally held as to the wisdom of such a momentous action, the orders of the Assembly were clear and explicit and so he threw himself with his wonted zeal into the leadership of the movement for Organic Union of the Evangelical Churches. He was elected the Chairman of the first Council and of its Ad interim Committee. He was greatly concerned lest the Assembly at Philadelphia might misinterpret the Plan of Union and misjudge the brethren of his own and other communions who in all the negotiations had not given the slightest hint of a desire to depart from the evangelical faith, but on the contrary, had exhibited only that loyalty to Christ as Saviour and Lord which could serve as a basis for coöperation in the advancement of His Kingdom. His association with the brethren of other communions, the intimate friendships which he formed had disarmed all the suspicions and fears which he might have entertained as in the case of strangers, and made him eager for union with those who had been invited to meet solely on an evangelical platform. And when the Assembly approved the plan, it seemed a fitting response to the appeal which he made from his chair on the platform when welcoming his Welsh brethren, the Lord seemed to give him in his weakness supernatural strength to say "But above all other things let us work with them and with all other Christians in that cause to which I have devoted my life, 'that they all may be one'; that is my message to you and to all other Christians, 'that they all may be one,' God bless us all."

It is significant that Dr. Roberts was not in sympathy with the Interchurch World Movement and mainly because he felt that the movement had not emerged in a natural and spontaneous way from the churches so as to wholly represent their mind and purpose and spirit, but had been thrust upon the churches in a frenzied effort to apply war standards and measures to Christian enterprises. It was not what it claimed to be and meant to be—an Inter-Church Movement. This again revealed his whole-hearted loyalty to the Christian Church as the divinely ordained agency for the establishment of God's kingdom upon the earth. An old chronicle in its description of an English gentleman stated that although he was not a religious man, he was otherwise an ideal churchman. Dr. Roberts as a great churchman believed in all the "notes" of the church which have been embodied in the Creeds, viz: Unity, Catholicity, Apostolicity and holiness. The last message which he gave to the Presbyterian Church, speaking as an aged Simeon about to depart, reveals the simple faith in Christ which was back of all his churchmanship.

"And now brethren, let us stand together. Let all controversy cease. Shoulder to shoulder let us go forward in the great work which God has entrusted to us. I tell you there is a vast amount of responsibility on the Presbyterian Church in these critical days, and may God enable us in all our congregations, our presbyteries, our synods, and especially in the General Assembly, to be true to that responsibility. God bless us all wherever we labor, and God grant us all one of these days to meet the Lord face to face. When God will order me so to do, I know not. But I wish to bear clear testimony here on this platform to my faith, my absolute faith in Jesus Christ as my Saviour, and that He will keep His every promise made unto me and to all believers. I thank you, brethren and friends."

The Assembly then rose and sang "Blest be the tie that binds."

Princeton.

J. ROSS STEVENSON.

REVIEWS OF RECENT LITERATURE

APOLOGETICAL THEOLOGY

The Relation between Religion and Science. A Biological Approach.

By ANGUS STEWART WOODBURN. 8vo.; pp. vii., 103. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago, Illinois. 1920. 75c net; postpaid, 80c.

"The attempt is made in this paper to examine the age-long problem of the interrelationship of religion and science from a new angle, namely that of psychology considered as a biological science." "The thesis proposed is that religion and science are differentiable attitudes toward the extra-human environment, involving specific ends and techniques for the attainment of these ends, and that these attitudes are the outgrowth of those ineradicable tendencies of life which we call innate and instinctive, so that both genetically and functionally they may be said to be biological." The theory presented is that these attitudes have their roots in behavior which, while instinctive, is multiple." "The order of procedure embraces an attempt to define the differentia of the religious and scientific attitudes, or the question of their psycho-physical functions"; and an "endeavor to discover the genetic elements in the innate and instinctive behavior out of which these differentiated attitudes have evolved, or the question of their psycho-physical genesis."

Mr. Woodburne has done his work well. He has written in an excellent spirit, and he would appear both to have touched every phase of his subject and to have read on it everything that was worth while. His criticism of positivism and of scientific agnosticism and of the monism of Haeckel is suggestive and effective. We are inclined to accept as being true so far as it goes his differentiation between religion and science, that religion seeks to establish social adjustments and relationships with the extra-human environment, whereas science endeavors to create mechanical adjustments and relationships with that environment. Of special importance is his insistence on the instinctive nature of religion as well as of science. Thus he grounds and demands the great argument for the objective reality of the Supernatural which Romanes stated so well when, in his *Essay on The Influence of Science on Religion*, he commented on the religious instinct of the human race as follows: "Elsewhere in the animal kingdom we never meet with such a thing as an instinct pointing aimlessly, and therefore the fact of man being, as it is said, 'a religious animal,'—i.e., presenting a class of feelings of a peculiar nature directed to particular ends, and most akin to, if not identical with, true instinct—is so far, in my opinion, a legitimate argument in favor of the reality of some object toward which the religious side of this animal's nature is directed." Admir-

able also is our author's chapter on "The Multiple Instinctive Origin of Religion and Science." The thesis is that the origin of both the religious and the scientific attitude, while instinctive, is at the same time multiple. He dwells, however, not so much on the multiplicity of human instincts as on the unification of these in human experience. In other words, religion and science embrace the whole man, and the whole man expresses himself in religion and science. Hence, there should be only harmony between them.

It is just here, however, that our author goes back on his premises. He more than squints towards, he even affirms, the Ritschlian position that religion is evaluatory while science is explanatory and that as such they may be not only differentiable, but independent, whereas the helpfulness of religion depends on its scientific reality and its scientific reality can be appreciated only in the light of its spiritual helpfulness. Christ could not be our Saviour if he were lying dead in a Syrian grave, and the fact of his universal dominion can be appreciated only by those whose eyes he has opened.

In a word, Mr. Woodburne's whole discussion, excellent though it is, is vitiated utterly by his standpoint. He believes in an extra-human environment, the Supernatural, God; but even God is developed out of our needs. Evolution takes the place of revelation. We make our God. He does not determine our needs, but our needs determine him. In the last analysis, man is God.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

The Christ of Revolution. By JOHN R. COATES, B.A. London: The Swarthmore Press, Ltd. (formerly trading as Headly Bros., Publishers, Ltd.) 72 Oxford Street, W. I. 1920. 8vo., pp. 133.

This is not, as might be supposed from the title, an attempt to present Christ as a socialist and as the author of social revolution. On the contrary, the writer distinguishes carefully between "the revolutions of mankind, which are concerned with the relation of human classes to one another and to the means of living" and "the revolution of Jesus, which deals with the inner relations of human nature itself and with the relation of man to God." At the same time, "the book is written in the belief that a careful historical investigation not only establishes the place of Jesus in history, but shows him as the supreme contributor to the solution of the problems of human society." This is so because right relationships to man depend, first of all, upon right relationships to God. "The divine order of human society" rests on his kingdom, which is "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." Hence, "this book goes forth to preach the gospel that God was, and is, in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself."

This it does well. It presents clearly and impressively "The Problem before Jesus," "The Programme of Jesus," "The Principles of Jesus," "The Glory of Jesus," and "The Power of Jesus." We make but two adverse criticisms:

1. Justice is not done to the apocalyptic aspects of Christ's kingdom. The latter are not denied, but they are largely overlooked. It is true

that Christ comes to each one of us at death; but it is hardly true to speak of this as "the *real*," if not the only coming (p. 77).

2. The necessity of the cross as the satisfaction of divine justice is not emphasized as the New Testament emphasizes it. The cross is presented rather as though it were the expression only or chiefly of love and forgiveness. We are not made to see, at least unmistakably, that in Christ crucified mercy and truth meet together and righteousness and peace kiss each other. Yet this is the great lesson of the cross, the supreme element in the power of Christ.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

The Social Evolution of Religion. By GEORGE WILLIS COOKE. 8vo., pp. xxiv., 416. Boston: The Stratford Company, Publishers. 1920.

"We have in this volume an exhaustive and accurate presentation of the entire field of modern study of religion." The fruit of over fifty years' investigation of its subject, it aims to explain and to indicate the change which has come about in the conception of religion in general and of Christianity in particular. That change is this. We see religion today as a human product rather than as a divine revelation, as derived from below by evolution rather than as imparted from above by revelation, as of man rather than of God. The evolution of this new conception, we are told, has been characteristically social. In becoming social man has become religious. Indeed, "fundamentally and essentially religion is a manifestation of the collective life of a band of men and women living together in social relations in order that they may best meet the demands for food, the perpetuation of their own existence as a collectivity through the birth of children, the protection of the group from enemies of whatever kind, and that they may satisfy the claims of the collective life emotionally, ethically and aesthetically." Thus the demands of man's social needs evolve, first of all, "Communal and Tribal Religion," then "Feudal Religion," then "National Religion," then "International Religion," then "Universal Religion." In the last chapter the author assumes the role of the prophet and foretells the religion of the future as "Cosmic and Human Motive." It is foreshadowed today "on the canvas of the painter, on the pages of the poet or may be of the novelist. Least of all is it presented by the prosy preacher of tradition and myth in the shape of theology and supernatural religion." Hence, religion is not passing away; it is coming to its own, the true religion, the religion not of God, but of man.

The reviewer would offer but two criticisms on this in some respects remarkable book:

1. The author has read too much. At least, he fails to organize what he has read. We do not say to him as Festus said to Paul, "Paul, thou art mad; thy much learning is turning thee mad"; but we do say that, as in the case of Herder's *Ideas for the Philosophy of History*, Mr. Cooke has been snowed up under the multiplicity and variety of his reading.

2. The author shows a significant lack of appreciation of the view

of religion that he would discredit. Darwin substituted blind natural selection for Divine Providence, but then Darwin spoke seriously and even sadly of his lack of religious appreciation. Clifford gave up his belief in a personal God, but then nothing is more touching than his lament that "The great Companion is dead." Mr. Cooke, however, can see nothing to regret in the passing of supernatural religion, indeed, of natural religion as commonly understood. On the contrary, he rejoices in it. Can we help questioning, then, the earnestness and consequent worth of his conclusions, especially in the following respects?

a. His depreciation of the place and work of the individual in the development of religion. We cannot but feel that he is more anxious to destroy religion than to find the truth as to its development when, for example, he declines to see in the Greek Mysteries an expression of individual rather than of national or communal religion.

2. His ignorance of or his ignoring of the difficulty in evolving religion out of sociality alone. It is no easier to account for it thus than it is to explain in this way, as Fiske tried to do, the evolution of morality out of sociality. In either case, what is to be done can be done only by presupposing religion or morality. There is a chasm between sociality and religion or morality, and we can bridge the chasm only as we find the material for doing so on this side of it. That is, to evolve religion out of sociality we must begin with a religious sociality. Sociality by itself will not yield it.

2. The confidence, the satisfaction, the delight, with which the author proceeds to deny the deity if not the actual existence of Christ, the personality if not the bare existence of God and, in a word, the reality of the Supernatural. He makes Christ as best "a gentle teacher." He regards God as a mere "principle" or "idea." He rules out the Supernatural together. One cannot help asking if he has not suffered a complete atrophy of his religious nature, and so is inadequate for the discernment and study of religious phenomena. How can he pass worthy judgment in the sphere of things divine who has never cried out "for the living God," who has never asked, "When shall I come and appear before God?"

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

A Better World. By TYLER DENNETT, Fellow of The American Geographical Society. Author of the Democratic Movement in Asia, etc. 8vo., pp. 173. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1920.

"As a study of the religious resources of the world for the preservation of peace this book is addressed both to the Church and to that larger group of people who hold very little to the demands and commands of ecclesiastical establishments, but who are still tremendously responsive to the idealism of Christ, realizing that it is the political, economic and biological, as well as personal and logical necessity of the world." "It argues boldly and without evasion that the day is already here when the Christian peoples of the earth must, in self-defence if for no nobler motive, definitely set before themselves the

task of bringing all mankind, themselves included, to the acceptance and practice of the Gospel of Jesus Christ." In a word, its thesis is that in the Gospel of Jesus Christ is the hope of democracy, and in Christian democracy is the hope of the world.

In the development and defense of this thesis there is much to which the reviewer would like to call attention and to commend. For example, the distinction drawn between the Church as an organization and the Christian as an individual. "No principle is more securely won," we are told, "than that the Church must go out and keep out of politics. But when the Church goes out, the Christian must come in. The separation of Church and State does not involve the separation of the Gospel and Life" (p. 139). Equally good is the emphasis put on Foreign Missions. "A missionary Christianity," it is affirmed, "is the biological necessity of civilization. Without it civilization will destroy itself" (p. 161).

On the other hand, the reviewer is constrained to indicate what seem to him to be certain serious defects. One of these is the apparent confusion of democracy with equality. Racial distinctions must, according to our author, be done away; for "all men are created free and equal." This, however, does not mean that all men are created the same. Rather does it mean, as Charles Sumner is said to have observed, "that all men are created free and with an equal right to try to make themselves equal." To do away with racial distinctions is as disastrous and ultimately as impossible as to do away with individual distinctions. In the last analysis, such distinctions are rooted in the purpose of him who "divideth to each one severally," not alike, but "even as he will" (1 Cor. xii. 11).

Again, exception must be taken to our author's internationalism. Is a "parliament of nations, a federation of the world," to be expected? and is it to be desired? Is not the individual nation ultimate in the sphere of the state? Has not God made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons and the bounds of their habitation: that they should seek God if haply they might feel after him and find him (Acts xvii. 26, 27)? In a word, is not the supernational the kingdom of God itself?

Finally, we must object to the secularistic tone of the whole discussion. Democracy is a result and one of the best results of Christianity. But it is a by-product, it is not its primary aim or end. Christ died to save us from sin and death, not primarily from earthly oppression; and civil freedom will be realized permanently only as we enter into "the glorious liberty of the children of God."

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

Germany's Moral Downfall. The Tragedy of Academic Materialism.

By ALEXANDER W. CRAWFORD, Professor of English in the University of Manitoba; formerly Fellow in Philosophy in Cornell University. 8vo., pp. 217. The Abingdon Press: New York and Cincinnati. 1919.

The thesis of this book is that all that Germany has done in the

war and all that she herself is suffering from it is the necessary because logical fruit of crass materialism undisguised and unrestrained. The best description of the discussion is the author's own summary and application of it. "The ethics of German militarism," he says, (p. 172) "is thus seen to be nothing but a gross materialism, and consists of a crude adaptation of the political ethics of Machiavelli and the biological ethics of Nietzsche, and has only the merit of a rough consistency. It has completely repudiated Kant, and has appropriated only some of the more doubtful elements in Fichte and Hegel, violating completely the deeper significance of these great thinkers. It is time for us, now, to recognize this crass materialism as not a new morality at all, nor as an explanation of the old, but as a complete denial of morality. Prussian militarism, and all such materialistic, egoistic schemes are a subversion of morality, and not an ethics at all. It is nothing but a materialistic gospel of might, shallow and brutal, and the greatest enemy of morality as well as of Christianity. It is a cancer that the world must totally eradicate and destroy, or civilization and all community of nations will themselves be destroyed." To all this the reviewer would take but a single exception. In his judgment German idealism is not blameless. German militarism and materialism have at least a root in Hegel's doctrine of the state; and the negative side of even Kant's philosophy, his Critique of the Pure Reason, rendered them, not only possible, but logically necessary. Make reason untrustworthy, whether by denying it or by exaggerating it, and materialism stands ready to take its place.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

Mind and Conduct. Morse Lectures delivered at The Union Theological Seminary in 1919. By HENRY RUTGERS MARSHALL. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1920. Pp. ix, 236. Price \$1.75.

The argument of this book, if we understand it correctly, is briefly as follows. In Part I. (pp. 3-69) the author explains his hypothesis of a "thoroughgoing noetic and neururgic correspondence" or that each mode of human conduct has corresponding with it a special and specific situation in consciousness. Let us apply the hypothesis to instinctive and adaptive actions. The former represent that department of human activity in which past situations bear on the present; the latter, that department in which the present situation bears on the future. What are the consciousness-correlates of each? The answer is that instinct-feelings correspond to instincts, and reasoning to adaptive activity. Now each special form of conduct is to be considered an "emphasis" within a physical system, and in accord with the hypothesis the corresponding consciousness is an "emphasis" in a psychic system. This assumption enables the author to define the Self. Emphasis has meaning only by contrast with the unemphatic. In the present instance we must therefore assume alongside the emphasized portion an unemphasized mass of physical activities on the one hand and of psychic activities on the other. This unemphatic psychic mass the author identifies with the

Self. It would thus seem that the Self must remain unknown, for if knowledge is consciousness of the emphatic portion, how can it apply to the unemphatic? From this unpleasant predicament, however, the author saves us by telling us that in self-consciousness there is presented an ego which is the image or simulacrum of the Self, and from the observation of which the Self may be known. Part II. (pp. 73-131) develops "Some Implications of the Correlation." Behavior and consciousness are each "creative," that is, each has a capacity of producing newness, or something more than the "redistribution of energy" which mechanistic systems say is all that is in behavior and consciousness. This "something more" the author takes to be that "newness" which mechanism is compelled to posit at some moment of past time, but which really is present from moment to moment in the activity of the Self. This assumption enables the author to define what are called "Ideals" and to explain the concepts of Freedom and Responsibility. The third and concluding portion of the book, (pp. 135-211) discusses what the author calls "Guides to Conduct" or in plainer language motives to action. Those mentioned are pain, pleasure, and happiness. Finally the issues that arise in the discussion of these "guides" are disposed of in the closing chapter on Intuition and Reason. In two appendices there is a discussion of "The Casual Relation Between Mind and Body," and "Outer-World Objects."

A bare outline cannot do the book justice. Dr. Marshall's language is terse and yet no statement is made without proof. The thought is stimulative and suggestive, and the attempt is to put before us what the author by his own reflection has thought through, not copied and half-assimilated from some other thinker. Nevertheless it seems doubtful whether the position taken can be maintained, because it cannot stand the empirical test. To make this clear let us remember that there are two main methods in psychology. One is to assert a proposition and then deduce its consequences. This is Dr. Marshall's method, and by it he is able to build an imposing structure, but one that is in constant danger of contradicting reality, and that calls for other improbable assertions when it does so. Thus the hypothesis of a thoroughgoing noetic and neururgic correspondence is contradicted by the empirical facts; for there are neural processes without any demonstrable consciousness correspondents, and there are states of consciousness for which no neural process can be discovered. To save the hypothesis, however, our author posits a kind of consciousness "so unemphatic as to escape our notice" (p. 30). But what can be the meaning of a consciousness of which we are unconscious? Furthermore what empirical proof can be given for asserting "the undifferentiated unemphatic psychic mass . . . is a something more of consciousness. In any moment this 'something more of consciousness' is the Self to which the presentations are given"? Again it seems pure assumption to say that the presented empirical ego of self-consciousness is an image of the Self as defined (p. 56). Other examples of the consequence of logical deduction may be cited: "We never err or sin. But, we

recognize in reflection that we *have erred* and *have sinned*, or that we are *about to err*, or *about to sin*;" (p. 131), or this, "Pain is a sense primary and pleasure secondary; for the capacity to store surplus energy necessary to pleasure production would seem to be dependent for its development upon a previous condition of overstrain that would involve pain" (p. 138). The other psychological method is that of experiment, infinitely tedious and slow perhaps, but with the advantage of keeping close to the actual world. This method also employs hypotheses, but it uses them as instruments of discovery, and if they are not in accord with the facts it modifies them. The volume before us with all its interest and attractiveness would be improved if more attention were given to this second way of investigation.

Lincoln University, Pa.

GEORGE JOHNSON.

EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY

The Religion of Israel. By GEORGE A. BARTON, PH.D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Semitic Language in Bryn Mawr College. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1918. 8vo. Pp. 287. Price \$2.00.

That the author of *A Sketch of Semitic Origins* would naturally approach this subject from the standpoint of the radical critic, was of course to be expected. Dr. Barton regards the religion of Israel a gradual development of primitive Semitic religion—a development so gradual that aside from the fact that Israel's relation to Yahweh rested on a "covenant" and this Yahweh was a "jealous God," it was not in the time of Moses "appreciably higher than other Semitic religions of the time" (p. 73), and even as late as the time of Elijah "it would have been hard to distinguish the religion of Israel from the religions of her neighbours" (p. 87). Ethical monotheism began with the 8th century prophets. "We do not find it [the spiritual period of religious and ethical conception] in any race until about the eighth century B.C." (p. 62). This means that the true religion of Israel—the reference is not, as we would fain believe, to the perversions, lapses and apostasies to which the O. T. writers constantly refer—was an idolatrous and sensual henotheism both in the days of Abraham and Moses and for centuries thereafter. Such conclusions as these rest in the main on two great assumptions: 1) That all the documents dealing with the early period are late and consequently unreliable. 2) That the early religion of Israel was practically the same as that of the neighboring nations. The one assumption calls in question the reliability of all the available data; the other professes to supply the test by which the reliability of said data is largely to be determined, and enables the critic to pick and choose as he sees fit. As a matter of fact these two assumptions merge into one; the strongest argument against the reliability of these documents being the fact that they give us an account of the religious history of Israel radically different

from the one which the critics accept. Statements in the records which accord with the view that the religion of Israel differentiated itself by a gradual, naturalistic process from primitive Semitic religion, or which can be forced to confirm it, are consequently accepted; statements which conflict with it are either ignored or rejected as untrustworthy.

Thus, the statement as to the "mode" of the oath taken by Abraham's servant (Gen. 24:2), although a mere detail, which a critic might easily set aside, is accepted as perfectly reliable because it can be interpreted to favor the view that "like other Semitic tribal deities he [Yahweh] was believed especially to preside over the functions of life" (p. 60)—an example of the emphasis upon the sensual and even the licentious, as a legitimate element in Israel's religion, which is one of the most distressing features in this book and in the conception of religious development which underlies it. But the "formula" of the oath (verse 3), which is far more important, is set aside, because "the traditional view [we would prefer to say, the Biblical view], which traces the ancestry of all the tribes to Abraham, who was himself a monotheist and a worshipper of Yahweh, has to be modified" (p. 43). Why does it have to be modified? Why can the relatively minor detail described in 24:2 be accepted without question, while the great affirmation of Abraham's faith in Jehovah as recorded in vs. 3 (also J), an affirmation entirely in accord with the consistent declaration of the entire Bible (Old and New Testaments, the Law and the Prophets and the Psalms, the Gospels and the Epistles, Jesus and the Apostles) as well as of Christian and Jewish tradition throughout the centuries that God called Abraham and promised to bless his seed, "has to be modified"? The real answer is: It has to be modified because it presupposes that the religion of Israel was essentially different in origin, development and in basic character from the religions of the neighboring peoples, that it was a religion of revelation and in its essence supernatural. This is irreconcilable with the view that the religion of Israel was originally the same as those of the neighboring peoples, that it was developed out of them by a naturalistic process and that in this evolution the "religious genius" of the Jew was the important and creative factor. The critic may give other reasons: archaeological evidence of an inconclusive character and capable of more than one interpretation, the results of the literary analysis, etc. But this is the real reason. The Bible states that the religion of Israel was from the very beginning radically different from other religions and the critic is convinced that the Bible is wrong.

We have nearly forty chapters in Genesis dealing with the lives of the patriarchs and four entire books (Exodus-Deuteronomy) dealing with the Mosaic age; and in them both the religious interest is paramount. Yet Dr. Barton feels obliged to confess: "Beyond the fact that Yahweh became the God of Israel by covenant at Horeb through the instrumentality of Moses, this outline [his sketch of the early religion]

is confessedly hypothetical" (p. 73). Why is it hypothetical? Because there is so little in the Bible which with utmost effort can be utilized for this evolutionary sketch, while so much has to be rejected as unreliable, because inconsistent and incompatible with it, that there is little left but theory out of which this sketch can be constructed.

In his treatment of the later development of Israel's religion, as of its beginnings, Dr. Barton follows the general scheme of the Wellhausen hypothesis, of the correctness of which he does not admit a doubt. That Deuteronomy "is demonstrably from the seventh century B.C."; that "broadly speaking, the prophets were anterior to the law"; that the Psalms are largely if not entirely post-exilic, the "first book" being compiled toward the end of the 5th century; that Chronicles is "an expurgated edition of the history of Israel" which misrepresents the facts; that Ruth was written as a protest against the "narrow zeal" of Ezra and Nehemiah as shown in their "campaign against foreign-born wives"; that Esther is largely fiction with a considerable admixture of myth; that Jonah is "a missionary tract," "delightful, attractive and entertaining" as a story, but impossible as history; that Isaiah is to be assigned to three different authors, Daniel to three, Micah to two, Zechariah to two; that Daniel is of Maccabean origin and later than the Ethiopic Enoch—these are some of the positions which he asserts with more or less positiveness as assured results.

The careful reader will receive the impression from this book, which, as has been indicated, states many of the critical theories and conclusions very boldly and baldly, that the critics make matters in some respects altogether too easy for themselves and that their theory when carefully scrutinized presents many more unexplained difficulties than the view which it seeks to replace. We will cite but two examples:

Dr. Barton tells us that the Mosaic religion was neither monotheistic nor spiritual. "It was not a demand for monotheism; it distinctly recognized the reality of other gods; it was not even in theory monotheistic" (p. 68). "The decalogue of J, on which the covenant at Sinai was based, had not prohibited the use of such images [idols such as the heathen used], but only of expensive images. 'Thou shalt make thee no molten gods' (Exod. 34:17) forbade them to have images of silver or gold, but left them free to use 'graven images' or cheap idols carved out of wood" (p. 81). This means that the first step in the direction of a non-idolatrous monotheism—an ideal not conceived of, the critics tell us, till centuries later, but by the Old Testament definitely declared to have been set up by Moses—was the prohibition of the use of *expensive* idols. Without regard to the exigencies of the critical theory, may it not be said that this explanation is absurd because contrary to common sense? If it be admitted that Moses aimed to elevate, however slightly, the religion of the Israelites—the critics would hardly accuse him of debasing it—would we not expect him to take steps which would at least tend to restrict idolatry and make it if possible less crude? The prohibition

of the use of crudely repulsive images of wood or terracotta, the requirement that the visible representation of the deity should incorporate the best and most costly in material and workmanship, that it should be kept in a shrine worthy of the deity and attended by priests and approached with elaborate ritual—all this would tend to elevate the worship, though without making any radical change in it. It would tend to raise it even above the level of the best regulated cults of the surrounding nations—Egypt and Babylon—where the gods were worshipped with elaborate and costly ritual. It would also tend toward a centralizing of the worship, to make it a truly national religion. But would not the prohibition of costly images only, tend in exactly the opposite direction? If it was admittedly right to make images of Yahweh, what possible reason could be given for the requirement that they should be cheap? That every one, even the poorest might have one in his house or on his person? Surely this would put a premium on idolatry! And would it not lead the people to despise Yahweh when they compared the meanness of his cult with its cheap, crude images, with the splendor of others? Can the critics point to a single historical parallel for such a peculiar procedure? We know something of the crudity and even obscenity of the cheap images used by Semitic peoples. If Moses allowed his people to continue using them and also prohibited them from making anything better, he certainly was the most remarkable religious reformer the world has ever seen. It would be a shame to compare such a Moses with Mohammed who stamped out all idolatry among the Arabs and made Islam an *imageless* religion. How this Moses could have come to be regarded by the men of later ages as the great founder of spiritual religion in Israel it is impossible to understand.

Our second example has a bearing on the first. We are told that among the 8th century prophets and in the best prophetic circles a religion without sacrifice was plainly and explicitly taught. Amos, according to our critic, denied that sacrifice had any part in the original covenant. "Ritual formed no part of it. Sacrifices and burnt offerings had no place in it." Micah 6:6-8 gives us "the ethical definition of religion." Yet Dr. Barton is forced to admit that with the introduction of the Priest Code in the 5th century ritual sacrifice became once more one of the most important factors in religion. This was, he tells us, a reaction, a compromise, due to the tremendous hold of primitive religious belief upon the masses of the people. This explanation raises an important question. If the prevalence of sacrifice and the insistence upon its importance in the 5th century is no proof that Amos did not denounce it in the 8th century, why is it necessary to suppose that the continuance of idolatrous customs in Israel in later times proves that Moses could not have condemned them? If the one is entirely consistent with the critical theory of Israel's religious development, why is not the other also?

Finally it is worthy of mention that the theory of the opposition of the early prophets to ritual sacrifice as such, and not merely to

a magical and mechanical interpretation of it which, like the indulgences of the Mediaeval Church, tended to foster sin, leads Dr. Barton to deny both the necessity and the reality of the Atonement. Dr. Barton was recently ordained to the priesthood of a Protestant Church. But he is entirely in agreement with Rabbi Kohler (cf. the April issue of this REVIEW, p. 350) when he says, "The Father needs no propitiation except the penitence of the son for whom he has waited so long." Both alike regard sacrifice as the expression of a primitive religious notion from which man in his upward striving has had difficulty in freeing himself. Dr. Barton speaks in this wise, "So far as western Asia is concerned it was left for early Christianity to inaugurate a religion entirely without such sacrifice, and then the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was compelled to interpret the death of Christ in sacrificial terms (Heb. 7-10) in order to explain why the new religion could discard this world-old custom" (p. 210). What a sad misconception this of the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews which regards Christianity as in a preëminent and unique sense *the* religion of sacrifice, because, while the blood of goats and calves could only make "remembrance of sins every year" and as a "shadow of good things to come" point forward to that of which they were a type, Christ as the high priest of our salvation "once offered himself for sin," and by that one offering "perfected forever them that are sanctified!" It is by the blood of Christ that we enter into the holiest, into the presence of God, into the Father's house. It is not in deference to a "world-old custom" that we are compelled to interpret the death of Christ in sacrificial terms, as if such language were really inappropriate of itself; it is because the Cross is *the* sacrifice for sin, the all-sufficient and the alone-availing, that no other words can be found which fully express its meaning. The Cross is not something to be explained away. It is to be glorified in as the great central fact of our religion.

Princeton.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.

HISTORICAL THEOLOGY

Biblical Christology. A study in Lutheran Dogmatics. By JOHN SCHALLER, Professor of Doctrinal Theology. Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Wauwatosa, Wis. 1919. Milwaukee, Wis. Northwestern Publishing House, Print. Pp. x, 179.

The author of this book is confident of two conclusions: first, that he has "here discussed all that is really known to man on the subject of Christology;" and second, that the Lutheran is the only valid Christology (pp. iv.-v.). His method is that of a statement of the thesis, supported by Scripture proof-texts, followed by theological notes mostly polemical. Broken up in this fashion, the treatment becomes mainly a professor's outline and gives a somewhat fragmentary appearance. The plan of salvation is first discussed, then the strictly

Christological theme, Redemption, treating of the Person of the Redeemer, the two states of Christ, and His three offices, closing with two Indices, one of subjects, the other of texts.

As a summary of Lutheran Christological teaching, this study is eminently successful. We have justification by faith (pp. 141-142), *communicatio idiomatum* (pp. 30-53), ubiquity of Christ's human nature (pp. 44-50, 78-81), the Holy Spirit's activity linked inseparably with the Word (p. 10), rejection of *ex opere operato* theory of the Sacraments (p. 109) and of the implied moralism of Freemasonry (p. 98)—all distinctive marks of the old Lutheranism.

In the sections on Election (pp. 4-20) the Calvinistic doctrine of the absolute decree is vigorously combatted. In its place we have a decree of universal salvation according to which God from eternity sincerely willed the salvation of all mankind, and at the same time chose certain definite persons whose final salvation He actually secured. Professor Schaller sees the difficulty involved in the Divine decree to save all men, and then a second decree to save only the elect (pp. 4-5). The former he calls "the counsel of universal salvation" (*der allgemeine Heilswille*). He makes no attempt to reconcile the two. Both, he says, are in Scripture, and Scripture, not reason, being the rule of faith, both must stand as they are. Calvinists are therefore condemned for their denial of these contradictory decrees. But their method is surely the more logical and rational. To say that God decreed indiscriminately the salvation of all men, and at the same time decreed to save only a part of mankind, is to say something that cannot, from the nature of the case, be true. And if such a contradiction were in Scripture, it would certainly tend so far to weaken the internal moral evidence for the divine inspiration of Scripture. But the texts (Ezek. 33:11, I Tim. 2:4, 2 Pet. 3:9) which are quoted in support of a universal redemptive decree, do not hold good except through forced exegesis. Wherever the genius of a language will allow, we are bound to let it clear away any seeming contradiction in Scripture. Fortunately, the Greek is just such a flexible language. So, if a self-consistent Bible yields the Calvinistic doctrine of a universal offer of the Gospel alongside of a particularistic decree, who can seriously object to this?

A further phase of Professor Schaller's view of Predestination is his specific type of Infralapsarianism, which has some affinity with the Amyraldian. Predestination, he argues, has two causes: the grace of God and the redemption of Christ. "God chose the elect *because* they are redeemed in the common redemption of all mankind" (p. 11. Cf. p. 14). This is plain confusion. It violates both temporal and logical priority. It is difficult to see how redemption can precede election, for the very decision to redeem is itself a selection. And the matter of order is pretty definitely settled in Rom. 8:28-30. Of course, no election is irrespective of the work of Christ. But this work is the *modus operandi* of the decree, not its cause. Nor can such be concluded from the two texts that are summoned (p. 11). To

argue Christ's redemption as the *cause* of the divine election, from the *ἐν αὐτῷ* of Eph. 1:4, is not only a precarious exegetical venture; it is also to fly in the face of the whole context (1:3-14) which clearly shows that the work of Christ and of the Holy Spirit is according to the Divine purpose and therefore subsequent to it. And there is nothing in 2 Tim. 1:9 that makes redemption the cause of election. What is there stated is, that the grace of God given to us in Christ was predestinated "before times eternal" and was actually manifested in the historical Christ. Every student of Messianic prophecy knows that the career of Jesus was foreordained.

Much space (pp. 30-53) is given to an exposition of the *communicatio idiomatum*. Here again the author falls into a hopeless inconsistency from which he is unable to extricate himself. There is only, he believes, a logical, not a real difference between the communication of natures and the communication of attributes. "It is a real communion which leaves both natures unchanged, and yet makes each nature a real participant in the *idiomata* of the other" (p. 37). The first half of this statement is possible and inevitable in any real union. The second half is simply unthinkable if the integrity of Christ's humanity and deity is to be conserved. According to Professor Schaller (p. 31) there is a real communication or transference of the attributes of one nature to the other, and yet there is no confusion of the two natures. How can this be? John 1:14 and Col. 2:9 certainly cannot be pressed as defence for such speculation, any more than any of the other texts that are alleged in support of it. The Scriptures never invalidate our fundamental distinction between communion and communication. To say that the human nature of Christ was endowed with divine attributes, that Christ's humanity "is so permeated with the divine nature that it participates in the perfections of divinity" (pp. 42, 43), is assuredly to confuse deity and humanity; and to explain, further, that this involves no essential change in the human nature because "the mode of possessing these perfections differs in the two natures," is far from satisfying.

In line with this method of argument, the old Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity, or the omnipresence of the human nature of Christ is steadfastly championed (pp. 44-50). Even the presence of Matt. 28:20 is bodily (p. 105). Yet it is claimed that this presence is illocal and *Dextra Dei est ubique*. To bolster up this theory, Christ's ascension was not strictly a local departure, but "an ocular demonstration" granted to the disciples to prove that His "tangible presence" was to be vouchsafed them no longer (p. 48). Consequently, the heaven of the ascension is not a circumscribed locality, and the dying Stephen could see Christ at God's right hand because Christ is omnipresent (pp. 77-82). This gives the heaven of Brentius, which, as Peter Martyr says, is nowhere.

A defect in Professor Schaller's Christology is met in his section on the Exinanition or humiliation of Christ. He holds that the incarnation itself was no part of the Exinanition (p. 55). Christ's

humiliation did not consist in "his being born," but only in His being born "in a low condition." This technical distinction involves a separation between cause and effect that is hardly possible in this instance. When a higher order of being assumes the nature of a lower order, that very act cannot be thought of as anything else than itself a lowering. Yet a still more serious defect in the author's teaching is, that Christ did not become a perfect man, like Adam, but assumed a human nature weakened and made infirm through the Fall (p. 57). He took on human nature as it was in B.C. 4. Here again we have speculation with a misuse of such texts as Heb. 2:14, Philip. 2:6-8, 2 Cor. 8:9.

There are other minor statements that impress one as theologically unsound; as when, for example, sanctification or the restoration of the divine image is spoken of as Christ's work (p. 143), an inaccurate way of saying what he says so well only three pages further on: "Christ is our Advocate at the throne of the Father, while the Holy Spirit is a Helper within the believer's heart" (p. 146). Nor will many thinkers who know his work and life agree that Dr. Charles Hodge was guilty of "rationalism, pure and simple" because he insisted that "the Bible never requires us to receive as true anything which the constitution of our nature given to us by God Himself, forces us to believe to be false or impossible" (pp. 34, 45). One would think this almost axiomatic. Indeed, if such were not the case, how could we safely interpret the Bible itself? Perhaps, after all, Professor Schaller speaks truly when he says: "The Reformed and the Lutheran theologies diverge in *principle*, not merely in detail!" (p. 50).

This study shows a comprehensive knowledge of the sources, and everywhere there is a genuine desire to appeal to Scripture. But the peculiar exegesis and, to our mind, unwarranted liberty in handling texts, create the impression of a case prejudged if not injured by bias, so that the author's "Biblical Christology" is too often open to the charge of not being strictly Biblical. In addition to this, his thoroughgoing anti-Calvinism occasionally betrays him into a heat of which the best that can be said is, that it is occasional.

Some features in the externals of the book are also in order. The method of referring to Scripture is not happy. The use of the colon for the comma in designating chapter and verse is hard to improve on. Sometimes, where the spacing is not ideal, it is confusing to follow. To take only one of many examples: Acts 8:12, 9:15, 27f., is surely an improvement on Acts 8, 12.9, 15.27f. (p. 85). Modified spelling is used regularly with "tho," "thru," and "thoro," though these are about the only words spelled after this fashion. The material is conveniently arranged, and the italicized words and expressions are most successful in bringing out the author's exact thought. The exclamation-point is over-laden, and probably with not such wise effect.

Hillsboro, Ohio.

BENJAMIN F. PAIST, JR.

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. By the REV. ARTHUR CROSTHWAITE, B.A. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Cloth. 12 mo. Pp. 263. Price \$1.60.

This volume in the series of *Indian Church Commentaries* is full of interest, especially to those who may not be familiar with the series to which it belongs. It is an endeavor to interpret an Epistle of Paul in the light of Indian religious thought, ancient and modern. The text used is that of the English Revised Version. The comments are brief and clear and contain continual references to conditions in India. To each chapter is appended a number of "additional notes" which contain extensive extracts from Indian literature. The writer naturally reveals his sympathy with the position of the Church of England in reference to "confirmation" and "baptism." He also defends at very great length the theory that the spiritual body promised to believers at the resurrection is now in this present life in process of formation, and that at death our souls are at once clothed with these bodies which are now in the stage of development. While this doctrine of the resurrection influences his exegesis of the opening verses of the fifth chapter, the main portion of the commentary embodies explanations and suggestions which are less open to dispute and which cannot fail to be of service to the Indian converts. The purpose of such a series of commentaries is certainly admirable, as they are intended to apply Christian truths to the immediate needs of those who have accepted Christianity in an environment which makes Christian faith peculiarly difficult.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

The Training of the Clergy. By H. MAYNARD SMITH, Vicar of Holy-Trinity, Malvern. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Paper. 12 mo. Pp. 48. Price 20 cents.

This is an essay in criticism on the report of the Archbishops' Committee dealing with the teaching office in the church. The conditions which it reflects are peculiar to England, and it considers problems which do not exist in the American churches where theological education is being given almost uniformly in established theological colleges or seminaries. Nevertheless many of the suggestions made by the writer are of universal interest and of permanent value. He insists that theological education is primarily concerned with religion and that candidates for the ministry should be taught a definite and positive gospel; and further that the study of the Bible should be central in all theological curricula so that each student will be made to acquire not only a general knowledge of the whole Bible, but a specific mastery of each particular book. He further insists that in addition to Church history and a knowledge of Christian doctrine, the candidate for the ministry should be carefully instructed in "voice production," in the "composition and delivery of sermons" and in the "leadership of public worship."

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

Quiet Talks on the Deeper Meaning of the War and its Relation to our Lord's Return. By S. D. Gordon. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1919. Pp. 286. \$1 net.

The spirit of the book is earnest, reverent, devout. The Scripture is honored and Christ is exalted throughout, and there is much to instruct and comfort the believer. But the author is no more successful when he essays the role of a prophet than a host of others whom the war has turned to prophesying. The argument will not carry conviction to many except those who are convinced already. Happily no attempt is made to fix the time of our Lord's return. That he may return at any moment is denied, for there are certain events that must precede his coming (appendix), yet "there is a working possibility that this will occur in our generation," a possibility which in the mind of the author is a probability (p. 69).

The persistence of the Jewish race is made the basis for a detailed program of the future. In the kingdom that Christ shall set up at his coming, "the Jew will be the *first nation* of the world, at the head of all the others." "God himself will reign, but he will reign *through* the Jew. Jesus the Son of God will be King of the Jews *and* through them of the whole earth. It will be a revival through Jesus of the old David dynasty" (p. 120). This is at war with the clear teaching of the New Testament that the barrier between Jews and Gentiles has been broken down, and they are all one in Christ Jesus. That the Jews shall be gathered into the Kingdom is plainly taught; that they shall form a spiritual aristocracy and reign over the Gentiles is foreign to the spirit and teaching of the Gospel. Elsewhere it is affirmed that "the Church will be associated with the King in the administration of the Kingdom, ruling over the Jew as in turn he rules over the world" (p. 241). As the church is here distinguished from the Jew, it would seem to indicate the Gentile Christians, and an idea is suggested as strange to the New Testament as the other.

The treatment of God's sovereignty and man's freedom is superficial and unsatisfactory. "God's sovereignty, rightly understood, doesn't mean that God is having his way. And it doesn't mean the way things are going is as he planned and plans. It does mean simply this: that before the game's done things will be righted" (p. 49). "Some day the lead of earth action, racial action, will swing from man's hands to God's. . . . But *at the present time* man is the leader in the action of earth. God is the Helper" (p. 50). This is a curious inversion of the truth. God and man change places. It would be interesting to compare this conception of a partial and limited sovereignty with the teaching of Jesus and of Paul. Nor is it easy to see why, if God is hampered in his purposes today by the will of man, there is any sure ground to believe that he will ever be able to accomplish them. If his sovereignty is limited by human freedom, it remains ultimately with man to determine whether the Divine will shall be done. And in that case upon what foundation does prophecy rest? God foretells, because he foresees; he foresees, because he foreordains. That is taught with all pos-

sible clearness both in the Old Testament and in the New. God respects the freedom of man, but he makes that freedom serve his sovereign will. How this may be we do not understand, but the truth is attested by Scripture, history and experience.

The Old Testament is termed the Kingdom Book and the New Testament, the Church Book (p. 238). "In the Old, there is no church. It comes into being on the day of Pentecost." It is hard to see in what possible sense the church is denied to the old economy. The church is one under all dispensations, beginning in the earthly paradise and finding its consummation in the paradise above.

A fantastic interpretation is put upon the words of Jeremiah (31:22): "A woman shall encompass a man." This is understood to mean that "the renewed Jew nation, then weak physically as a woman characteristically is in comparison with a man, would become the strong nation, so acknowledged, protecting the other nations even as a man protects a woman" (p. 198).

It is by no means universally accepted by scholars that the image of Nebuchadnezzar's vision (Dan. 2) represents in its several parts the "succession of Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Grecian and Roman Kingdoms" (p. 207). On the contrary, as is noted in Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Vol. I, p. 555, the prevailing opinion today is that the four kingdoms are the Babylonian, the Median, the Persian and the Grecian. It is curious to note that the reference to the King of Greece in Daniel is thrown into the future (p. 211).

There is much in the book that is well said, and is adapted to instruct and edify the Church of God. But the sketch of the future does not carry conviction, and there is little room for doubt that this program of the days to come will find its place with the multitude that have gone before and been forgotten.

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

The Drama of the Face. By ELWIN LINCOLN HOUSE, D.D., author of *The Psychology of Orthodoxy*, *The Mind of God*, etc. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1919. Pp. 258. \$1.75 net.

These lecture-sermons have been given to thousands in the churches, and on the Chautauqua platform. They contain much important truth of a practical nature. Valuable suggestions are made regarding the conduct of life. Due honor is rendered to Christ and the teaching throughout is sound and wholesome.

There is a tendency to exaggeration, and the argument would often carry more weight if it were urged with greater caution and restraint. There are unguarded statements that need correction or limitation. "God has nothing but his own substance out of which to make worlds and all that they contain" (p. 40). Is matter then of the substance of God? "Sensual love is the only love that the greater part of humanity knows" (p. 74). "The hope of man is not in any system of industry, or form of government, or fraternal organization, or political power, or pull, or education, but in conduct. Here is the big word of the hour; here is the secret of life; here is the destiny of man" (p. 179). Yet

Dr. House makes it abundantly plain that our hope is not in ourselves, but in God alone. "The one great religion of the world is conscience" (p. 143). Yet elsewhere it is said, "Conscience is not a law, but a faculty" (p. 147). "Man is measured by his memory!" (p. 197). After all that is said of the value and power of memory it is rather disconcerting to come upon the prayer with which the chapter closes: "Open not the books of memory, O God, for therein is my bitterness and weakness and death" (211). "You cannot acquire charm" (p. 218). Yet "Charm comes from a life radiant and beautiful within." Cannot that life be acquired? This awkward sentence is found on p. 164—"Some think that a young man who is doing this, is getting rid of so much 'bile,' and when ejected will leave the body purified and better."

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

The Perils of Respectability. By the RIGHT REVEREND CHARLES FISKE, D.D., LL.D., Bishop Coadjutor of Central New York. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1920. Pp. 224.

This volume of sermons is a plea for greater earnestness in the Christian life, a larger measure of service and sacrifice. The Laodicean temper so prevalent in the church is sternly and justly rebuked. The spirit of the book is devout and reverent, and due honor is accorded to Christ as Savior and Lord. We read with interest that "Religious workers in army camps and at the front discovered that there was just one service which had wonderful popularity with the men, wonderful power and impressiveness. The service which always took hold of men's hearts was the Lord's own service, the Holy Communion—that service which commemorates the World's great sacrifice, the Calvary tragedy that ended in the Eastern (sic) triumph. The men always showed that they loved it. They could not tell why, but love it they did" (p. 139). It must be added that while the sermons are always clear and sensible they contain little that is striking in thought or style.

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Summit Views and Other Sermons. By JOHN EDWARD BUSHNELL, D.D., Pastor of the Westminster Presbyterian Church, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1919. Pp. 190. \$1.25 net.

This is a delightful volume. The Gospel is preached with simplicity, tenderness and power. Christ is magnified and exalted, and Dr. Bushnell has caught the spirit of his Master. There is a dignity, a sobriety, a sanity, a sweet reasonableness of thought, blended with fervent tender emotion, that satisfies mind and heart. The thought is fresh and stimulating, the style strong and clear. There is none of that straining after effect which is so common in the sermons of today. The Cross is given its rightful place. "If Christianity is alive today it is because the Cross is at the center of it and makes its appeal because of the blood which stains it" (p. 135). "The Cross is the center of all faith" (p. 137), "the beginning of all our hope" (p. 138). These sermons do not play upon the circumference of truth, but reach the center.

There is an unfortunate misplacing of pages which throws several sermons into confusion (pp. 128-154). An awkward sentence occurs on p. 158. Some of the titles are very expressive, and are borne out by the treatment of the text—Is America Discovered yet?; Magnitudes beyond the Narrows; Heavenward Thistledown; The Church of the Holy Entertainment. We rejoice that preaching of this kind finds a place in one of our leading churches.

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Forgotten Faces. By GEORGE CLARKE PECK. Methodist Book Concern. 1919. Pp. 219. \$1.25 net.

This is a volume of rare interest and charm. Its purpose is "to point out the faces of a group of Bible characters whose names are unfamiliar, if, indeed, you ever heard them." And the work is admirably done. The titles are suggestive and inviting: The Face of an Outcast; The Hidden Face; The Face that Baffles; The Artist-Face; The Face that Flinched; The Unsmiling Face; The Face of Mystery; The Frustrate Ghost-Face; The Face Averted; The Recovered Face; The Face of Stone; The Twilight Face; The Equivocal Face; The Face in the Crowd; the Money-Face; The Unawakened Face; The Face that Softened under Love. The portraits of such Bible characters as Enoch, and Laban, and Jephthah, and Mephibosheth, and Malchus, and Onesimus, are painted with a skillful hand and a sympathetic touch. The sketches are full of life, and convey lessons of great moment couched in strong and incisive phrase. And throughout the whole there is a warmth of feeling which reaches the heart. The thought is fresh and striking without straining the text. Altogether it is a volume to be read with profit and delight.

It is not in accord with the best critical judgment to say of Jephthah's daughter that "there is no valid reason for supposing that the fulfillment of the father's vow cost his child her life. The implication is that she was pledged to some sort of 'separate' life, like the nuns, and that she heroically helped her distracted father to keep his vow" (p. 91). And the slighting reference to the angels and their ministry to men (p. 196) is not in harmony with the spirit of Scripture teaching.

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

"Songs in the Night." By MALCOLM JAMES MCLEOD, Minister of Collegiate Church of St. Nicholas, New York City. Fleming H. Revell Co. 1919. Pp. 192. \$1.25 net.

The titles of the sermons are lines of familiar hymns, and the book breathes throughout the spirit of hope and courage and faith. Blest is the man who from his own sorrow can speak such gracious and inspiring words, comforting others with that comfort wherewith he himself is comforted of God. Frequent even excessive use of poetry is a marked feature of the volume. It is observed that "Churches with a hard, stern creed rarely blossom into song. Calvinism as a rule has never created great song. Presbyterianism has given us fewer hymns than any of the great denominations" (p. 182). Christ is mag-

nified, and the duty of entire self-surrender to him is powerfully presented. The comment upon our Lord's method of speech might lead us to infer that English was his mother-tongue (p. 46). The book speaks from the heart to the heart and is admirably adapted to meet the needs of those to whom it is dedicated—"all my comrades in the School of Sorrow."

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Sermons on the Gospels, Advent to Trinity. By ERNEST P. PFATTEICHER, D.D., Pastor Trinity Church, Reading, Pennsylvania. General Council Publication House. Philadelphia. 1918. Pp. 317. \$1.75.

"The sermons contained in this volume were preached in the Church of the Holy Communion, Philadelphia, to a congregation consisting in part of University and College students. . . . The endeavor throughout is to set forth Jesus Christ as the Savior of the world." In these words the author indicates the character and aim of the book. The truth is presented, but ordinarily not in a striking or impressive way. Both the thought and the style are rather commonplace. We are told that at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee Jesus effaces himself. "Throughout it all" (the miracle) "there is no touch of Jesus, there is no outward demonstration of power" (p. 99). Self-sacrifice is his method of "meeting the hour." But John says that he "manifested his glory; and his disciples believed on him."

It cannot be said that "both Matthew and Luke place the parable of the sower and all other parables uttered by the Master after the sermon on the mount" (p. 145). See Matt. ix. 16, 17; Luke v. 36. The doctrine of the Kenosis is apparently confounded with the fact of our Lord's humiliation. With what warrant is it said that "the work of the Holy Spirit is more important than His person" (p. 302)? Do not the value and efficacy of his work depend upon his person?

We read that "grace is the feminine quality in the person of Christ" (p. 305), but the representation of grace is partial and inadequate.

Princeton.

J. RITCHIE SMITH.

Religion Among American Men. Published by the Association Press.

This book is "The first of a series of studies made by the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook." It proceeds on the theory that "This our Army in the World War, has surely been a great cross section of American life," and therefore sees no essential difference between the American citizenry and the American soldiery. And we believe the facts will warrant the assumption. A man does not become religious by changing his garment. The khaki and the camp do not change the character. The war wrought only revelations where many looked for revolutions. To that extent the editors admit that the conclusions of the book are "disappointing."

The first main division deals with: "The state of religion as

revealed in the Army," with the following as some of the conclusions:

"There is one generalization, in particular, which the evidence in hand makes it necessary to record—the widespread ignorance on elementary religious matters, even of those who professed to be church members."

Then this concerning the Honor Roll: "The Honor Roll does not show the number of men who have been interested in the church. It shows instead the number of men in whom the Church has been interested—which is a very different thing."

Later, this: "Judging by the Army, we have a large majority of nominal christians, a very considerable body of nominal church members and a small nucleus of conscious christians and active church members."

There is the possibility of just a crumb of comfort in this: "If definite believers are a small minority, it is quite as clear that definite unbelievers are almost negligible from the point of view of numbers."

Summarizing "the faith of the majority," we learn this first: "They tended to think that religion is primarily a matter of deeds rather than of belief—that belief does not matter," which proves, if it is true, that the average American is a better toiler and fighter than he is a thinker.

The conclusions of the second and central section of the book—"The Effect of the War on Religion in the Army"—are no conclusions at all, but confessions: "In view of the diversity of conditions and the conflict of reports, it would be futile and premature to attempt any statement as to whether the total effect on personal religion has been favorable or unfavorable—we do not know."

And later, this: "A considerable group believe that, considering the men as a whole, there has been no great change in either direction."

The third and last section consists of a series of "Lessons for the Church"—in the matter of "Church Membership," "Religious Education," "Public Worship," "Moral Life and Standards," "Responsibility for the Community," and "Church Unity."

It is interesting and should be instructive to read this: "The most serious failure of the Church is the Church's failure as a teacher"—and that by common consent of chaplains and religious workers of every kind.

Not all will agree to the suggestion that, "A Christian interpretation of sex life must be a regular part of all Christian education."

But all thoughtful persons will recognize the need of "a far more serious attention to the Sunday School and a candid examination of its curriculum and methods of teaching"; and also that, "The religious instruction and training given in the home outlives all other religious education . . . and, in directing and controlling that influence, lies our greatest opportunity."

One rises from reading this book, with some very clear convictions. Our prayers and our predictions to the contrary, the War has wrought

no benefit to the soldier and brought no benediction to the Church. It is still true that a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit.

The War has created no new problems and calls for no new programs or preaching. The old problems are ever new, and the new problems are ever of old. And the old preaching alone, will solve all problems, both old and new. And those of us who were there, will testify that the soldier knew, instinctively and unerringly, whether the message of the speaker came from his heart or his lungs.

The collaborators emerge from their mass of data with the very definite "conviction that, from the Army, the Church has something to learn." But there is another conviction that antedates and also survives that—the Army had very much to learn from the Church. And if it be true that the Church has failed as a teacher, it is also true that the Army has failed as a scholar. Sitting at the feet of the Church, our Army rose up terrifically and ingloriously ignorant.

Will the Church sit thus at the feet of the Army today and fail to learn her post-war-lesson?

Pittsburgh.

JOHN ALISON.

What Did Jesus Teach? An Examination of the Educational Material and Method of the Master. By FRANK PIERREPONT GRAVES, PH.D.
Dean of the School of Education, University of Pennsylvania.
New York: The Macmillan Company. 1919.

This book is interesting because it grew out of the attempt by Provost Smith of the University of Pennsylvania, to induce the students to study the teaching of the Christ. It is worthy of note that the effort was quite successful and seventy-two groups totalling about two thousand, were formed with leaders from the Faculty, Christian Association Secretaries, older students and friends of the University. The groups were composed of Protestants of all denominations, Catholics, Jews and not a few who were in the habit of calling themselves Agnostics. The group leaders were trained by the author and this book is the outcome of that normal training.

Dean Graves admits that he has no theological training and is without skill in exegesis, he only claims to approach the subject "from the angle of a history of education man." He adheres strictly to his subject: "What did Jesus teach?" Jesus is the supreme and authoritative teacher and the failure to accept and obey His teaching, is the explanation of the failure of modern civilization. The chapters on Jesus' method of teaching, and "Jesus' conception and ideals of life" are clear and valuable. On the other hand there are some statements which should be guarded against: the statement that Jesus began his mission in Galilee is not correct unless the author means the ministry described by the Synoptists; what is known as plenary inspiration, he calls a "mechanical" theory and those who hold it "verbalists"; in fact the author does not seem to think that there is any need of inspiration and quotes the introductory words of Luke's Gospel, to show that Luke was not aware of any such guidance; he

asserts twice that Jesus nowhere taught "total depravity," and clearly he understands that doctrine to mean that a man is as bad as he can be.

Notwithstanding these and some other faults and infelicities, the book is worth while; and in the hands of the pastor or a trained Bible scholar, it can be used to advantage in adult classes.

Ashbourne, Pa.

RICHARD MONTGOMERY.

Apt Illustrations for Public Addresses. By A. BERNARD WEBBER. New York: George H. Doran Company.

This book has grown out of a ministerial experience and the attempt to meet a need. It consists of a number of interesting and appropriate illustrations, prose and poetical, under proper heads and these arranged alphabetically.

The Story of George Fox, by RUFUS M. JONES. Author of "St. Paul the Hero," "Hebrew Heroes." New York: Macmillan Company.

This is one of the series of "Great Leader's Lives" in course of preparation for young readers, which will include the study of some of the greatest moral and spiritual leaders of the race. Mr. Jones is well fitted to tell the story for he is a member of the Orthodox branch of the Society of Friends, and a teacher in Haverford College. The author tells the story sympathetically of the thoughtful, serious boy in the hamlet of Drayton in Leicestershire, England, who in the troublous days on the eve of the Civil War, could find no answer in the Establishment to the questions that troubled his soul and who found peace only as Christ spake to him. The story of the busy life that followed, of the cruel things he endured, the converts he made in England and America, of the influence of his preaching in that harsh age, is told most interestingly. Necessarily the writer does not go into the matter of Fox's theological views to any great extent, but the book will repay careful reading by younger and older readers.

Ashbourne, Pa.

RICHARD MONTGOMERY.

Collapse of Christless Civilizations. By RICHARD CAMERON WYLIE, D.D., LL.D., author of "Our Educational System: is it Christian or Secular"? "Sabbath Laws in the United States," etc. National Reform Association, Pittsburgh, Pa.

This is not a war book except in the sense that it was called out by the conditions following the War. We are still reaping the aftermath of war. Not only is there the upheaval in the financial world but the moral tone of the nations has been lowered, divorce is increasing and so is Sabbath desecration with the attendant neglect of the services of the sanctuary. The childish prophecy of the self-appointed prophets, that the boys would come back from the war eager to attend the services of the Church and enthusiastic in its activities, is utterly without fulfilment. It is time to make clear that "well roars the storm to him who hears across the storm the louder voice." Only the voice of the Christ can speak the word of hope and peace. It is time to proclaim that the kingdoms of this world belong to God and his Christ. Of itself no League of Nations, offensive or defensive, will secure

present peace or prevent another world war; only the teaching of the Christ accepted and practiced. The book is timely.

Ashbourne, Pa.

RICHARD MONTGOMERY.

GENERAL LITERATURE

The Obligation of Contracts Clause of the United States Constitution.

By WARREN B. HUNTING, PH.D., Late Second Lieutenant, 168th Infantry, A.E.F. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1919. 8vo. Pp. x, 120. (Series xxxvii, No. 4, of the Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. Under the Direction of the Department of History, Political Economy, and Political Science.)

As usual in the case of the Johns Hopkins University Studies, a lucid, learned and in every way satisfactory paper, a real contribution and one well worth while. A melancholy interest attaches to it from the fact that its author lost his life while fighting with the American forces in France and before, according to his own plan, he had completed this discussion.

Princeton.

WILLIAM BRENTON GREENE, JR.

Mountains in the Mist,

Mushrooms on the Moor. By F. W. BOREHAM. New York: The Abingdon Press, Cloth, 12 mo. Pp. 280, 285. Price \$1.25 each.

The essays contained in these two volumes are delightful and refreshing. They are at the same time brilliant and beautiful, humorous and wise, abounding in surprising paradox and weighty with messages of abiding worth, instinct with human interest and ever leading to the high summits of Christian faith. The author is well known in Australia and in England, but may need an introduction to many American readers. His essays will be welcomed by all lovers of literature as masterpieces of English prose. His subjects cover a very wide range and the treatment of his themes is invariably quaint, original, fascinating, and suggestive of an unusual acquaintance with men and books.

Princeton.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

Spiritual Voices in Modern Literature. By TREVOR H. DAVIES, D.D.

New York: George H. Doran Co. 1919. 8 vo. Pp. x, 312.

This volume contains a series of lectures delivered in the Metropolitan Church of Toronto, Canada, in the winter of 1918-1919. The object of the author, as he himself states it, was to find in the special works discussed modern illustrations of some of the great truths to which the church stands committed, more particularly, illustrations of "the yearning of man and the divine response in the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." He does not attempt essays in literature, but the en-

forcement of Christian truth. In reality the book accomplishes both. The essays are charming in their literary quality, and he succeeds in enforcing many fundamental Christian doctrines. A statement of the chapter headings will exhibit his plan and indicate what we shall find discussed in each. They are: I. Francis Thompson: "The Hound of Heaven." An epic of the love that will not let us go; II. Ibsen: "Peer Gynt." The ignominy of half-heartedness; III. John Ruskin: "The Seven Lamps of Architecture." A proclamation of the laws of life; IV. Tennyson: "In Memoriam." A poet's plea for faith; V. "The Letters of James Smetham." The use of the imagination in religion; VI. Wordsworth: "Ode to Duty." Freedom and restraint; VII. Morley: "Life of Gladstone." The creative power of the Christian faith; VIII. Robert Browning: "Saul." The heart's cry for Jesus Christ; IX. Nathaniel Hawthorne: "The Scarlet Letter." The fact of sin; X. John Masefield: "The Everlasting Mercy." The fact of conversion. Some changes in the order of the lectures when printed would have increased their cumulative effect, since they fall into three categories of Sin, Salvation and Life or Living. The first of these lectures, based on a short poem of the not widely known poet, Francis Thompson, is most alluring, as it describes the poet's vain attempt to escape the seeking love of God; the lost sheep, who despite his persistent wanderings was brought back to the fold. In the midst of the teeming life of London he saw

The traffic of Jacob's ladder
Pitched between Heaven and Charing Cross

.
And lo, Christ walking on the water,
Not of Gennesaret, but Thames.

Each lecture has, as a motto rather than a text, one or more passages from the Bible. The chapter on Thompson is necessarily headed with the passage from the 139th Psalm; "Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit," and Luke 15:4. That on Ibsen's *Peer Gynt* has the verses describing the indecision of Felix. *Peer Gynt* is described as "a man who goes into the world to please himself, whose main object is to escape difficulty, and who carries with him, as a prized portion of his spiritual equipment, sensitive antennae quick to detect and to shrink from any obstacles which lie in the way." The scriptural motto for Tennyson's "In Memoriam" is, of course, "The just shall live by faith." Dr. Davies finds that in this poem, as others have found, Tennyson affirms "the soul's faith in a God of righteous love, in the survival of personality beyond the bounds of physical life, and in the inward sense of duty, which has found its supreme outward authority in Jesus Christ our Lord." The Letters of James Smetham illustrate the use of the imagination in religion, in the mind of the lecturer. They also illustrate, perhaps more strongly, the artist's estimate of spiritual values. Indeed, he set so much store by spiritual things and spent so much time in religious exer-

cises and in Bible study that he was criticised by his friend Rossetti for not concentrating on his art. In the lecture on Morley's "Gladstone" Dr. Davies emphasizes the spiritual faith of the English statesman and makes the striking remark: "Gladstone is unthinkable without Jesus Christ." The strongest of these lectures is that on Hawthorne's "Scarlet Letter," which unavoidably illustrates the fact of sin. When reading this tragic story it would be well, Dr. Davies thinks, "to keep our New Testament open by our side as we read, for though Hawthorne does not preach Christ as Redeemer, he has tremendous power to make us feel our need of Him." The book is beautifully printed on paper unusually good for these days, and the publishers are fully justified in saying of it: "These delightful studies exhibit in unusual measure a sympathetic insight into human nature and its spiritual problems and a finely discriminating appreciation of literary values. It is a volume of rare charm."

Princeton.

JOSEPH H. DULLES.

The Care of Documents and Management of Archives. By CHARLES JOHNSON, M.A., London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1919. Pp. 47. [New York: Macmillan. \$0.20.]

This is No. 5 of "Helps for Students of History," edited by C. Johnson and J. P. Whitney, and contains directions for the proper treatment of archives, which the author classes as "dead papers." No one who has read Richard de Bury's *Philobiblon* will cavil at the publication of such a technical booklet by a society whose aim is the promotion of Christian knowledge. The author reminds us that the Greek word *ἀρχεῖον* denoted the residence of the magistrate and was transferred to the collection of official documents stored there. He defines archives as consisting of "one or more groups of documents no longer in current use, each group of which has accrued in the custody of an individual or a department in the ordinary course of business, and forms an organic whole, reflecting the organization and history of the office which produced it." He uses the term business in a broad sense. It may be one's business to be a historian, and government is a business. He treats of methods of classification, housing, shelving, etc. The work of an archivist is so absorbing and so important that he must "renounce historical work on his own account, except as an exercise to keep alive his interest in history and his knowledge of the needs and progress of historical study in the fields in which his documents can be useful." The treatise will be helpful to the professional archivist.

Princeton.

JOSEPH H. DULLES.

The New Map of Asia, 1900-1919. By HERBERT ADAMS GIBBONS. New York: The Century Co., 1919.

This is one of a class of books which are so good that they ought to have been better. It is a thesaurus of valuable historical information on matters of vital interest to the present-day world, yet often presents

such one-sided interpretation of events and policies and principles as to threaten an unfortunate influence upon international relations, hindering the consummation of that great World Brotherhood which our author appears to believe himself clearing the ground and laying right foundations. That he could make so grave a mistake would seem to be due to over-attention to the evidences of Europe's devotion to a policy of world-wide Eminent Domain, leading to an *a priori* judgment of every act of abstention of European nations as necessarily proceeding from purely selfish motives, while every opposition of any people to a European nation, however savage, treacherous or ungrateful that opposition, is seen only as the reaction of a righteous "national consciousness" against "tyranny and aggression." And, though compelled to admit that Great Britain has been "a little less conscienceless" than some of the other nations, he appears to cherish a special dislike for our British cousins. To one who has lived long in the Orient, it seems evident that our author has given too much weight to the tales and opinions of certain "men in the street," native and foreign, whose name is Legion in the East, accepting as first authorities those who are really but third or fourth, and often with such an animus as to render them no authorities at all.

It is an exceeding pity that so versatile, informing and entertaining a pen should thus aid the prevention of that rapidly developing sympathetic understanding and fellowship between Great Britain and America, the outgrowth of a closer acquaintance in a common cause, over which happier relations the peoples and the leaders of both nations have heartily rejoiced, finding in them one of the chief assurances of future world peace and progress. The bitterness and lack of cooperation of the past have been largely due to misunderstandings, these to misrepresentations, and these in turn to a basal lack of confidence founded on some mistakes of both nations and more suspicions; the outgrowth of rivalry and memories of the far past. All of these unfortunate relations, it is feared, Dr. Gibbons' book tends to perpetuate. Much might be quoted from British authorities to throw a very different light on that nation's world-policy; but to avoid anything of an ex-parte character, the reviewer will confine himself to a few American opinions. Said "Sam" Higginbotham in a recent lecture:

"It is non-British India where autocracy has sway. English literature has taught British Indians ideas of liberty; and Great Britain, not through compulsion but from desire, has granted to the natives of India such measure of autonomy and representation in government as they have been capable of exercising with safety to themselves and to the maintenance of peace and the progress of civilization in the great Peninsula. Malcontents are, of course, against any government; but it is iniquitous to charge Great Britain with 'a policy of frightfulness' when she sternly represses murderous and treacherous outbreaks against a rule regarded by the most upright and enlightened leaders of the people as more beneficent than any which they could themselves maintain, or when she repels with bombing airplanes the barbarous

hordes of tribes beyond the border who have, without warning, swooped down on isolated garrisons, which would otherwise be massacred to a man." Another American missionary, Dr. C. A. R. Janvier, born in India, now President of one of the most successful colleges in India, protesting against the publication, in the religious press of America, of the poet Rabindranath Tagore's reckless criticism of the British Government in India, says, "As one who has experienced British rule in India through very many years and has closely observed it through nearly as many more, I challenge the accuracy of the implications contained in the words "enormity," "gagged silence," "universal agony," "dumb anguish of terror," and "degradation not fit for human being." I am confident that every American missionary who has served in India will join me when I take the position that the poet's ill-judged statements ought never to have been given publicity in a religious journal, and that, if quoted at all, they should at least have been accompanied by the explanation that the action complained of had been taken under martial law and in consequence of an outbreak of mob-violence, arson and murder which threatened the peace of the whole of the Punjab." A third, Dr. J. P. Jones, in his well-known book, *Krishna or Christ*, says, "The government of India is, perhaps the most elaborate in the world; the highest powers of statesmanship have been manifested by the successive rulers during more than a century in the development of a State which is extraordinary no less in the complication of its provisions and details than in the wise adaptation of human laws to meet the multitudinous exigencies of this great conglomeration of peoples. They have not only had to consider the manifold character of the different portions of the population of the land; what is more difficult still, they have been compelled to ingratiate themselves with the Indians by conserving, so far as possible, those myriads of ancient laws and customs which obtain there, regarded by the Hindus as divinely given and as possessing irresistible claim upon them for all time. No greater mistake can be made than to think that India is either crudely or poorly governed. Owing to the great poverty of the land it is extremely difficult to maintain so costly and elaborate a regime as the present one; yet it is difficult to understand why the 'injustice' of Indian taxes should be asserted unless it be on the ground that the poverty of the people should exempt them from *any* of the burdens of taxation, a theory beautifully generous to the people but fatal to the maintenance of any government. The modern Hindu is vastly better off than was his ancestor of two or three centuries ago, when taxes of 33 percent to 50 percent were enacted, as against the present 5 1-2 percent. Even today the native states are much harder upon the people than is the British Raj." Admitting that in the earlier days the commercial motive was paramount in British relations to India, this writer says, "The English nation gradually came to realize their own responsibility as a people to the land and to the Indians thus brought within their influence. This contact and communion of interests became to them

the voice of responsibility and of obligation to impart their blessings to them as well as to take their material resources from them. The dawn of the new altruistic sense towards its subject people, though long deferred, rapidly grew into full daylight and Great Britain today feels, as no country has felt before, its privilege and duty to bestow upon its dependency in the East the highest and best which it can furnish." One might quote at great length, from this and other authorities, to the same effect. I will merely add a few words from the well-known Bishop Thoburn, "With a population greater than that of the five great powers of Europe put together; with a revenue exceeding \$350,000,000; with a foreign commerce worth \$768,000,000 annually; with a standing army of 230,000 strong, more than two-thirds of them native soldiers; with a drilled police force of more than 150,000 men; with a code of laws in many respects superior to those found on the statute books of European countries; and with courts of justice as impartial and as faithfully conducted as any to be found in the world, India may well claim a place among the great empires of the present era."

Enough has been said. The reviewer will not attempt to deal with the question of Great Britain's treatment of the Ottoman Empire, in which, by the admission of the British themselves, there is much to her discredit; though this discredit is measurably lessened in the judicial mind which constantly reflects on the nature of Britain's frequent dilemma, an apparently inevitable choice between two evils (from the world point-of-view as well as from her own), in which she chose what seemed the lesser evil of two,—or many—though it sometimes meant the keeping of very bad company and the sponsoring of very questionable policies. The chief objections to our author's treatment of the subject are his failure to mention this often stupendous difficulty, and his frequent indulgence in ungenerous generalizations and insinuations, e.g., "without regard for the aspirations and interests of its inhabitants;" "if the regeneration of Turkey came to anything, Great Britain would be forced to return Egypt and Cyprus; it would create trouble in India and other possessions if the Moslem Turks demonstrated the ability of self-government;" "As for the Arabs, their claims were listened to only in so far as the claims did not conflict with British plans and interests;" etc., etc. Similar treatment is given to Britain's position in Persia, the Caucasus, Palestine and Siam. On the other hand, our author assuredly does not describe the Turk whom the world has come to know, or whom the missionary has known for long, in his sketch of him on pages 156, 162, and he was certainly justified in expecting "indignant denial" of his statement that "so long as Christians (in Moslem lands) were content with their lot, and did not try to become political masters or equals through their own efforts or through demanding protection or aid from outside states," security of life and property was not withdrawn.

As an American who has known China through more than a quarter of a century of life in that land, who has passed through the times of

"European aggression," and who has, through all these years, come, as never before, in contact with the British as diplomatists, business men, neighbors, friends, colleagues in missionary work, even members of his own household, the reviewer would like to add his word of testimony to those from India, as follows: First, it would be difficult to find any intelligent Britisher in China today, who would defend Britain's entire course in the so-called "Opium War," or the India-China opium trade as maintained until recent years. Britain has of late done much to atone for the errors of the past by the sympathetic leniency of her dealings with China in the ending of that dreadful traffic. Moreover that War was not ALL OPIUM, though commonly thought of in that way. China herself is grateful today for the opening to foreign trade and western civilization which has come to her during the past century, without which she would be now the laughing-stock of the world, or would have been rent asunder by still more forcible and less considerate aggressions. Second, in the "foreign aggressions" of the last decade of the Nineteenth Century, Great Britain was the least aggressive and the least selfish of all the European "aggressors." Her demanding of Weihaiwei was, in principle and in fact, more defensive than aggressive, defensive of herself, of China, of the world, against the very real perils of Russian, German and Japanese domination in the Far East. While we may congratulate ourselves, as Americans, on the fact that we have had no part in these demands for territory and special privileges; we have also more reason than we often think to congratulate ourselves that, as such things were to be, our British cousins, who had larger interests immediately at stake than we, establish themselves just where they did. I have no question that, if ever alien powers can be induced to do that most magnanimous thing, that thing best befitting a true League of Nations and a "New World," namely the renunciation of all that was China, Great Britain will be the first to agree to it, though she really has the most of value to renounce, and that value not inhering in the seized territories, but largely British improvements upon it during the years of her possession. The fact that the Yangtze Valley has been regarded, for many years, as a special sphere of British influence, though with no political control, has done more than any one factor to stabilize China internally and in relation to more aggressively disposed "neighbors," near and far. It is, therefore, most unfair and most untrue to refer to the Yangtze Valley as "a British dependency." Even more intolerable is the insinuation that Great Britain will hereafter endeavor to "arrive at an agreement with Japan to divide up Shantung!"

It is quite possible that our author is right in saying, page 315, that "the provinces north of Mongolia and Mauchuria and bordering the Japan Sea and the Sea of Okhotsk belong to the Far East and have been lost to European eminent domain"; but the reason why his prediction may come true is not the "decision" of the Entente Allies, but their appalling indecision with regard to intervention in Siberia against

the Bolsheviks. Better not have intervened at all, perhaps, than to have done it in such half-hearted fashion, allowing Japan to despatch so large a proportion of the total force. However, if Japan shall have that region for a permanent possession, and be induced to withdraw her militaristic, imperialistic hand from China and Korea, she will have land for her imperative expansion and her neighbors *may* have peace. Our author, we believe, has ascribed to Japan altogether too early a prevision of the perils of European eminent domain, and quite mistakenly ascribed her war with China over Korea to displeasure with China over the latter country's toleration of European aggressions. Japan's treatment of both Korea and China, in recent years, has made it only too apparent that the motive actuating her policy has been, not "Asia for the Asiatics," but Asia for the Japanese, a monstrous exaggeration of one of the principles of eminent domain,—that which has characterized Prussia,—the Japanese "Ueber-mensch," without any of those altruistic principles which have at least relieved the ideal in the case of Great Britain, and, to some extent, France. Our author admits much of this, yet leaves the impression that China made the great mistake of her life when she did not accept the impertinent suggestion of Japan that they together reform Korea, though that country bore no political relation to Japan, nor wanted any. The result would have been that Japan's marvelous powers of "benevolent assimilation" (!) would have been exercised over all,—or the greater part,—of China, as they have been over Korea, and the world would have witnessed modern Korea's deplorable plight multiplied twenty-fold.

Were this review not altogether too long, detailed exception might be taken to the inadequate account of Japan's infamous Twenty-one Demands, presented to China in 1915, about which Japan's representatives at European courts and in Peking deliberately lied, first asserting that she had made no demands, then admitting fifteen, while all the time she held China by the throat and said, "Swallow them all without complaining to Europe or America, or our armies are at your doors."

If our author had transferred half of the "righteous indignation" poured out upon the nations of Europe,—especially Great Britain,—to Japan and half of the "sweet charity" covering the multitude of Japan's sins, to Europe, the book would have preserved a more just balance and would have helped forward the day of mutual understanding and helpfulness between East and West, as well as between the two nations best fitted to hasten that day, Great Britain and the United States of America.

Princeton.

C. H. FENN.

Pronunciation of Standard English in America. By GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP, Professor of English in Columbia University. Oxford University Press, New York. 1919. Cloth, 12 mo. Pp. 235.

Strictly speaking there is no authoritative standard of pronunciation. The usage of cultivated speakers is supposed to be our standard, and the dictionaries are supposed to record that usage. But even cultivated

speakers differ, and different sections of the country have their peculiarities, and in many cases the dictionaries are forced to give several pronunciations for the same word. Our speech has been formed unconsciously and by imitation. We drop consonants and vowels, or change their sounds; and no one who has not made a careful study of the subject knows how far his own speech, and that of others, differs from the theoretical standard. Reference to the dictionary helps us to avoid blunders in the pronunciation of unfamiliar words; but to insure a clear and careful enunciation, and to form an intelligent opinion of the pronunciation least likely to attract attention as peculiar, one needs a knowledge of the elementary sounds of the language and the method of their formation, and an ear trained to detect slight differences of sound in the pronunciation of individuals and in different localities. Professor Krapp has had an excellent opportunity at Columbia, especially in the summer school, to note the differences of speech in people of many classes from all parts of the country. This book is the outcome of his observations, not of the study of dictionaries. It does not attempt to determine what should be the pronunciation, but what pronunciations are actually in use. Its purpose is to help students to observe the facts and to make their own choices. It explains the mechanism of speech, the elementary sounds of the language and their formation, and the various ways of representing these sounds in our customary spelling, and discusses the pronunciation of a large number of words in common use. Fifty pages are given to phonetic transcriptions of the speech of individuals, recorded by the author and others, with transcriptions of dialects of different parts of the country, and a comparison of American English with Northern and Southern English. Phonetics is not the exact science that many suppose it to be. There are differences of opinion about the facts and about the method of presenting the facts. So one may differ in some minor matters from the conclusions of Professor Krapp, and in a few cases from his method; but the book is a thorough and practical presentation of the whole subject, based on phonetic principles and personal observation.

Princeton.

HENRY W. SMITH.

Overland For Gold. By FRANK H. CHELEY. Abingdon Press.

A tale of the mad chase for gold when gold was discovered in Colorado. There are enough of thrills to satisfy any boy; and the story is clean and full of interesting information of the days of the "Pike's Peak or Bust" adventure.

Ashbourne, Pa.

RICHARD MONTGOMERY.

Comte Léon Tolstoï: Journal Intime des quinze dernières années de sa vie 1895-1910. Traduit du Russe par NATACHA ROSTOWA et M^{TE} JEAN-DEBRET. Préface, Commentaires et Table Analytique de son biographe PAUL BIRUKOFF. Paris: Ernest Flammarion; Genève: J. -H. Jeheber. 1917. Crown 8vo., pp. xvi, 343.

Tolstoi began to keep a diary at the age of eighteen. Except for cer-

tain interruptions, the longest of which was thirteen years, he continued the habit up to within three days of his death in 1910. His attitude toward this diary varied considerably. M. Birukoff points out that while he thought of ordering the diary covering the period up to the date of his marriage to be destroyed: "To the journal of his last years he attached, on the contrary, great importance and thought that of all his writings, which should be published after his death, it would be much the most instructive."

It will be of interest to quote here and there a characteristic passage:

In the Entry of 28 May 1896, noon I. P. [*Iasnaïa Poliana*] he writes among other things of "decadence in art." Referring to the poetry of Mallarmé and others, which he admitted that he did not understand and considered absurd, he says: "These reflections have led me to the conclusion that of all the arts (I speak of the decadence of poetry: of symbolism in painting, etc.) music, the chief, has deviated from the right way and has become lodged in a cul-de-sac. It is Beethoven, the musical genius, who led it astray by his voice, and many others, self-styled *connaisseurs despotes*, men without aesthetical perception, who judge art.

Goethe? Shakespeare? Everything that bears their name is deemed good and we strive in vain to discover beauty in things which are stupid and a failure (*bêtes, ratées*), thus perverting the popular taste. All the great geniuses: the Goethes, the Shakespeares, the Beethovens, the Michelangelos produced, alongside of good works, some things not merely mediocre, but absolutely awful. Moreover, mediocre artists produce some works of inferior quality, but never anything very bad, while the recognized geniuses, like Shakespeare, Goethe, Beethoven, Bach create sometimes what is sublime, sometimes downright abominations.

19 July 1896.

3. To love one's enemies! It is difficult, exceptional . . . Like everything which is truly good. But what joy to attain it! There is a marvelous sweetness in this love, likewise in the attempt to attain it. This sentiment of pure joy shows itself in inverse proportion to the attraction which the object loved inspires in us. To love one's enemies is a spiritual delight.

4. Someone causes me suffering. If I think only of myself, my suffering increases and I am dismayed by the thought, To what might this lead? But all that is necessary is for me to think of the man who has made me suffer, to think of his sufferings, of himself, that recovery may come immediately. Sometimes it is very simple, when you have already gotten far enough to be able to love your tyrant. But in any event it is always possible, even if hard."

9 August 1897. I.P.

"Stakhovitch has come. I have read to him "On Art." Chapter 10 is not good. I have worked fairly well. Written some letters, none of any consequence. I must write to Ivan Mikhailovitch.

"Jotted down in my book:

1. Domesticity is an institution which warps life and perverts it. No sooner do we have domestics than we multiply our needs. We

make living complex and it becomes a burden. Instead of joyously performing the work ourselves, we experience nothing but irritation while we let others do it; but what is worse is that we renounce the duty of life, the realization of brotherhood.

2. Aesthetics and Ethics are the two arms of the lever; in proportion as and to the extent that one of the sides is lengthened the other is shortened. No sooner does a man lose the moral sense, than he becomes peculiarly sensitive to the aesthetic.

3. Men recognize two gods: the God whom they want to compel to serve them, of whom they require, by means of prayer, the granting of their desires; and another God whom we ought to serve, directing all our desires toward the fulfilment of his will.

4. Old people ordinarily love to travel, to change their abode. Is it the premonition of the last journey?"

M. Birukoff points out in the Preface that the translating and editing of the Diary was a difficult task, owing to the fact that being intended by Tolstoi primarily merely for his own use, it contained abbreviations, unfinished sentences, etc., which so careful a stylist would never have allowed to find a place in a manuscript intended for publication. One would hardly suspect this from the translation which appears to be an admirable piece of work.

Princeton.

OSWALD T. ALLIS.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

American Church Monthly, New Brunswick, July: HAMILTON SCHUYLER, The Unpopularity of the Church; FRANK GAVIN, Spiritism as a Religion; FLOYD S. LEACH, The Social Message of the Church. *The Same*, August: FREDERICK S. PENFOLD, The Nonconformity of the Catholic Religion; BERNARD I. BELL, Servants of God Tomorrow; ORROK COLLOQUE, Einstein and Catholic Theology. *The Same*, September: JARED S. MOORE, Psychoanalysis and Divine Grace; ARTHUR G. ROBERTS, Why the Church Attracts Denominationalists; ERNEST PUGH, The Nicene Creed: an Impassable Barrier.

American Journal of Theology, Chicago, July: ERNEST D. BURTON, Recent Tendencies of the Northern Baptist Churches; MARTIN RADE, Present Situation of Christianity in Germany; HARRY T. STOCK, Christian Missions Among the American Indians; WILLIAM MUSS-ARNOLT, Scottish Service Book of 1637; A. S. WOODBURNE, The Description of Religion; H. E. BRUNNER, New Religious Movement in Switzerland; HENRY J. CADBURY, Luke—Translator or Author; HENRY J. CADBURY, A Study of Luke's Source Material; SHIRLEY J. CASE, Intellectual Development of Augustine; IAN C. HANNAH, History of Christology.

Bibliotheca Sacra, Oberlin, July: ALBERT W. MOORE, The Temptations in the Wilderness; WILLIAM H. JOHNSON, The Finality of Christianity; CHARLES SUPER, Education versus Enlightenment; HAROLD M.

WIENER, Contributions to the New Theory of the Composition of the Pentateuch (iv).

Catholic Historical Review, Washington, July: HERBERT I. PRIESTLEY, Franciscan Explorations in California; F. G. HOLWECK, Beginnings of the Church in Little Rock; OWEN B. CORRIGAN, First Annual Meeting of the Hierarchy; PETER GUILDAY, Appointment of Father John Carroll as Prefect-Apostolic.

Church Quarterly Review, London, July: E. G. SELWYN, The First Scottish Episcopacy; T. B. STRONG, The Christian Doctrine of Atonement; MIKAEL HERTZBERG, Relations Between the English and Norwegian Church; LORD CHARNWOOD, The Church and the League of Nations; ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, A Roman Catholic View of Reunion; C. E. FLÖYSTRUP, Anglicanism and Lutheranism; C. H. TURNER AND A. NAIRNE, The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion; Spiritual Reconstruction and the Lambeth Conference.

East & West, London, July: P. N. F. Young, University Education in India; B. T. BUTCHER, Presentation of Missions to Men; B. H. P. FISHER, Home Rule Movement in Indian Missions; F. J. BADCOCK, A Vision of Peace; E. HAYWARD, A Problem from Nigeria; IRVING P. JOHNSON, The Proposed Concordat with the Congregationalists; A. E. BURN, Reunion.

Expositor, London, July: A. T. ROBERTSON, The Christ of Luke's Gospel; T. H. ROBINSON, The Structure of the Book of Jeremiah; H. R. MACKINTOSH, Jesus Christ and Prayer; J. M. SHAW, Can Faith be Indifferent to the Bodily Resurrection of Our Lord?; J. P. LILLEY, William Robertson Smith: Recollections of a Fellow-Student. *The Same*: August: J. BATTERSBY HARFORD, Handley Carr Glyn Moule; D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, Arguments from the Pentateuch for the Future Life; W. ERNEST BEET, The Mystery of the Sealed Book; J. P. LILLEY, William Robertson Smith: Recollections of a Fellow-Student; JAMES MOFFATT, Pickings from the Papyri; RENDEL HARRIS, A Further Note on the Original Title of St. Mark; VACHER BURCH, The Original Arrangement of the Sermon on the Mount. *The Same*, September: ADAM C. WELCH, Joel and the Post-Exilic Community; E. W. WINSTANLEY, The Outlook of the Apologists; RENDEL HARRIS, Rivers of Living Water; J. M. E. ROSS, The Point of Strain in Christian Ethic; H. C. A. TOWNSEND, Our Conception of God; JOHN A. HUTTON, An Hard Saying.

Expository Times, Edinburgh, July: Notes of Recent Exposition; G. BUCHANAN GRAY, Job, Ecclesiastes, and a new Babylonian Fragment; JOHN A. HUTTON, The Holy Spirit and Christ; W. D. NIVEN, The Upsurge of Barbarism; H. J. WOTHERSPOON, Use of Sign and Symbol in Worship. *The Same*, August: Notes of Recent Exposition; WALTER F. ADENY, Synoptic Variations; JOHN A. F. GREGG, 'I am the Good Shepherd,' a Study; GEORGE STEVEN, Nicodemus; WILLIAM E. WILSON, Our Lord's Cry on the Cross. *The Same*, September: Notes of Recent Exposition; J. DICK FLEMING, Belief in God and Its Rational Basis; HERBERT G. WOOD, The Pilgrim Fathers and the Oxford

Movement; H. J. WOTHERSPOON, Fellowship in Relation to Christian Service; P. A. GORDON CLARK, The Huntington Palimpsest.

Homiletic Review, New York, July: RUFUS M. JONES, The Greatest Rivalries of Life; D. R. PIPER AND A. T. ROBERTSON, Have we any Use for Creeds?; J. WESTBY EARNSHAW, Mystical Experiences; FRED SMITH, The Value of Symbolism for Protestantism. *The Same*, August: RUFUS M. JONES, Preparation for Life's Greatest Business; ROBERT E. HUME, Sadhu Sunder Singh—the Christian "Holy Man" of India; T. W. HARWOOD, Religious Dividing Lines; OTTO BRASKAMP, The Sunday School Movement in China. *The Same*, September: JOHN W. BUCKHAM, Sweet Herbs on Bleak Shores; A. T. ROBERTSON, The Speeches in the Acts; J. L. LOVE, Implications of "Our Daily Bread"; EDWARD C. BALDWIN, Jesus and the Testament of Solomon.

International Journal of Ethics, Concord, July: NORMAN WILDE, The Attack on the State; FRANK C. SHARP, The Problem of the Fair Wage; H. W. WRIGHT, Rational Self-Interest and the Social Adjustment; JAMES LINDSAY, Ethical Value of Individuality; HELEN H. PARKHURST, Evolution of Mastery; A. K. ROGERS, Nietzsche and the Aristocratic Ideal.

Interpreter, London, July: R. H. KENNETT, Place of Sacrifice in the Church of Israel; F. R. BARRY, What do we mean by God?; S. P. T. PRIDEAUX, Democracy and the Idea of the Atonement; H. D. A. MAJOR, The Magna Charta of Re-union; J. G. McCORMICK, The Contribution of the Evangelicals to the Church; ROBERT A. AYTOUN, A Critical Study of Job's "Oath of Clearance"; C. D. WILLIAMS, Influence of Education on Race Characteristics.

Journal of Negro History, Washington, July: WILLIAM R. RIDDELL, Slavery in Canada.

Journal of Theological Studies, London, July: ABBÉ J. BESSIÈRES, La Tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Saint Basile; V. BURCH, The Gospel according to the Hebrews; Some new Matter Chiefly from Coptic Sources; M. EPOSITO, A Seventh-Century Commentary on the Catholic Epistles; A. COWLEY, A Hittite Word in Hebrew.

London Quarterly Review, London, July: J. BUTLER BURKE, Intellect and Intuition; C. SYDNEY CARTER, The Pilgrim Fathers; THOS. F. LOCKYER, What are 'Our Doctrines'?; FRANK BALLARD, The Last Flicker of Materialism; J. ALFRED FAULKNER, Luther and the Great War; E. J. THOMPSON, Jerusalem: War Memories.

Lutheran Quarterly, Gettysburg, July: ABDEL R. WENTZ, Ministry of Evil Men in the Church; JOHN ERLER, Evolution of Christianity; J. A. SINGMASTER, The Bible a Divine Revelation; ADAM STUMP, Suggestions on the Psychology of Preaching.

Methodist Quarterly Review, Nashville, July: KENNETH S. GUTHRIE, Plotinus as Methodist Philosopher; GEORGE R. STUART, Sam P. Jones the Preacher; B. F. ATKINSON, What is Bible Holiness?; LEWIS H. CHRISMAN, Fundamental Teaching of Thomas Carlyle; ALBERT L. SCALES, Higher Christian Education; JOHN W. BOSWELL, Methodism—

an Exponent of Christianity; HUGH W. ROBERTSON, *The Theology of Colonial America*; C. A. TUCKER, *Milton's Satan*.

Methodist Review, New York, July: F. C. EISELEN, *Israel's Unique Contribution to True Religion*; J. H. WILLEY, *The Mayflower 1620—1920*; J. A. FAULKNER, *Was Paul the After Christ?*; ROBERT S. WALKER, *Spiritual Hints from Nature*; E. C. WILM, *The Church and the Child*; ALBERT E. KIRK, *Keeping God in Ethics*; C. E. LIBBEY, *Office or Study? The Same*, September-October: GEORGE A. WILSON, *the Place of the Will in Religion*; ALBERT B. STORMS, *The College and Modern Socialism*; S. ARTHUR COOK, *Childhood Religion*; FRANK C. LOCKWOOD, *Education and Democracy*.

Monist, Chicago, July: R. W. SELLARS, *Space and Time*; RAYMOND LENOIR, *Psychology of Ribot and Contemporary Thought*; W. O. BRIGSTOCKE, *Logical Fictions* (con.); S. N. PATTEN, *Cosmic Processes*; ALBERT J. EDMUNDS, *End of Mark in the Curetonian Syriac*.

Reformed Church Review, Lancaster, July: WILLIAM J. HINKE, *Sources of Reformed Church History in Pennsylvania*; RICHARD C. SCHIEDT, *The Supreme Task of the Church at the Dawn of the New Era*; RAYMOND CALKINS, *The Things that Remain*; C. W. TRUXALL, *The Problem of the School and the Church*; SAMUEL J. KIRK, *Principle of Brotherhood and Christian Education*; FRESTON A. DE LONG, *Some Aspects of Zionism*.

Review and Expositor, Louisville, July: J. F. LOVE, *Baptist Missions in the New World Order*; ARTHUR DAKIN, *Baptist Influence in the New Order*; VICTOR I. MASTERS, *Baptists and the Christianizing of America in the New Order*; EDWARD B. POLLARD, *Baptist Preaching in the New Era*; THEODORE G. SOARES, *Baptist Polity in the New Order*; W. O. CARVER, *Baptists and the Problem of World Missions*; E. C. ROUTH, *Baptist Journalism in the New World Order*; GEORGE B. EAGER, *Calvin and Roger Williams in Relation to Religious Liberty*; A. T. ROBERTSON, *Place of Baptists in Modern Scholarship*.

Southwestern Journal of Theology, Fort Worth, July: E. Y. MULLINS, *The Life of Power versus the Life of Privilege*; J. F. VICHERT, *The Gospel of Christ*; J. W. BAILEY, *Christian Education—A Defence and a Plea*; ALBERT VENTING, *The Cross of Christ*.

Union Seminary Review, Richmond, July: RUSSELL CECIL, *The Charlotte General Assembly of 1920*; J. E. FLOW, *The Character of Jesus is a Proof of His Historicity*; ANDREW W. BLACKWOOD, *The Biographical Sermon*; W. H. T. SQUIRES, *The Rise of Presbyterianism in Tidewater Virginia*; J. LEIGHTON STUART, *Peking University*.

Yale Review, New Haven, July: SIMEON STRUNSKY, *The Unreal and the Paramount Issue*; EUGENE L. FISK, *Prolonging Human Life*; CHANCEY B. TINKER, *British Poetry under Stress of War*; CASMIR LUBOMIRSKI, *Poland in the New Europe*; E. A. CROSS, *The Truth about Teachers*; HENRY J. FORD, *Radicalism in American Politics*; HAROLD J. LASKI, *Democracy at the Crossroads*; H. L. MENCKEN, *The National Literature*; AUGUSTA DE WITT, *A Native of Java*.

Biblica, Roma, I:3: J. M. BOVER, *De mystica unione "in Christo*

Iesu" secundum B. Paulum; C. LATTEY, The Place of Memory in the Composition of the Synoptic Gospels; P. JOÛON, Notes de morphologie hébraïque; S. G. MERCATI, Note papirologiche; A. FERNÁNDEZ, A propósito de un artículo.

Bilychnis, Roma, Maggio-Giugno: E. TROUBETZKOY, L'utopia bolscevica e il movimento religioso in Russia; G. TUCCI, A proposito dei rapporti fra Cristianesimo e Buddismo; U. BRAUZZI, Il benessere economico; G. PIOLI, L "Etica della simpatia" nella "Teoria dei sentimenti moral" di A. Smith; G. E. MEILLE, Psicologia di combattenti cristiani.

Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift, Baarn, Juni: J. WATERINK, Nederlandsche trekken in het karakter der "reformierten Gemeinden" over onze Oostelijke grenzen; K. SCHILDER, De Ondergang van den Antichrist; H. W. VAN DER VAART SMIT, Professor Visscher's Rectorale Rede. *The Same*, Juli-August: G. CH. AALDERS, Het Sinäischrift; W. C. F. VAN HELSDINGEN, Ingezonden.

Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique, Toulouse, Juillet: L. GOUGAUD, La Vie érémetique au moyen age; J. BAINVEL, Les écrits spirituels du P. V. Huby; O. MARCHETTI, La vertu est-elle un effort?; Notes sur la vie mystique.

Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, Lausanne, Juin-Juillet: ARNOLD REYMOND, Pascal et l'apologétique chrétienne.

Rivista Trimestrale di Studi Filosofici e Religiosi, Perugia, I:2: A. BONUCCI, Lo spirito come oggetto; M. VINCIGUERRA, "Le Confessioni" di Antonio Fogazzaro; AD. LEVI, Il pensiero filosofico di B. Varisco; R. MORGHEN, Intorno al prologo giovanneo; E. BUONAIUTI, L'esperienza e il messaggio di Paolo; B. VARISCO, Moralità e nazionalità.

Nieuwe Theologische Studien, Groningen, Den Haag, III:1-6: M. LINDENBORN, Zettingsstudie voor Bijbelverklaring; TH. L. W. VAN RAVESTEYN, De Messias bij Haggai en Zacharia; W. J. AALDERS, Amerikansche Kerkgeschiedenis; F. H. TH. BÖHL, Nieuwe boeken over het Oude Volk. J. A. RUST, Kennis—kritische Godienst-philosophie; H. M. VAN NES, Kerk, In- en Uitwendige Zending; W. J. AALDERS, Kerk- en Dogmen-Geschiedenis; J. TAL, Rasjie als Bijbelverklaarder; C. VAN GELDEREN, De Elamologie; H. TH. OBBINK, Heilige boeken; M. VAN RHIJN, Over den vorm van de woorden van Jezus; F. W. C. L. SCHULTE, Bar-Abbas een bijnaam; J. DE ZWAAN, Nieuwe methoden, oude resultaten; J. DE ZWAAN, Nieuwe gezichtspunten bij exegese; H. J. TOXOPEÛS, Over den wetenschappelijken arbeid van Mgr. Pierre Batiffol; J. J. WOLDENDORP, Filippenzen; M. VAN RHIJN, Menno Simons; A. VAN DER FLIER, Hoe moet de oudtestamentische Godsnaam in een vertaling worden weergegeven?; J. DE ZWAAN, Christendom en Keizertijd; F. H. TH. BÖHL, Palestina's verleden en heden.

The Princeton Theological Review

EDITED FOR THE
FACULTY

J. ROSS STEVENSON
BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD
JOHN DEWITT
GEERHARDUS VOS
WILLIAM P. ARMSTRONG
FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER
CASPAR WISTAR HODGE
HENRY W. SMITH

FRANCIS L. PATTON
JOHN D. DAVIS
WM. BRENTON GREENE, JR.
ROBERT DICK WILSON
CHARLES R. ERDMAN
J. RITCHIE SMITH
J. GRESHAM MACHEN
OSWALD T. ALLIS

JOSEPH H. DULLES

BY
OSWALD T. ALLIS

VOLUME XVIII
1920

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS
PRINCETON

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS



ARTICLES

ESCHATOLOGY OF THE PSALTER. By Geerhardus Vos.....	I
ALBRECHT RITSCHL AND HIS DOCTRINE OF CHRISTIAN PERFECTION— ARTICLE II. By Benjamin B. Warfield.....	44
USE OF THE WORDS FOR GOD IN THE APOCRYPHAL AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHICAL LITERATURE OF THE JEWS. By Robert Dick Wilson..	103
PROBLEMS OF PEACE. By Daniel S. Gage.....	123
SPIRITIST THEOLOGIANS. By John Fox.....	193
THE RELIGION OF MODERN CHINA. By Courtenay H. Fenn.....	229
THE RECLOTHING AND CORONATION OF JOSHUA. By John D. Davis	256
"MISERABLE SINNER CHRISTIANITY" IN THE HANDS OF THE RATIONALISTS—ARTICLE I. By Benjamin B. Warfield.....	269
THOMAS GUTHRIE. By Clarence Edward Macartney.....	369
"MISERABLE SINNER CHRISTIANITY" IN THE HANDS OF THE RATIONALISTS—ARTICLE II. By Benjamin B. Warfield.....	399
THE NAMES OF GOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Robert Dick Wilson	460
THE RITSCHLIANS AND THE PREEXISTENCE OF CHRIST—PART I By Jan Karel van Baalen	493
"MISERABLE SINNER CHRISTIANITY" IN THE HANDS OF THE RATIONALISTS—ARTICLE III. By Benjamin B. Warfield.....	545
THE RITSCHLIANS AND THE PREEXISTENCE OF CHRIST—PART II. By Jan Karel van Baalen	611
AN INTERPRETATION OF ISAIAH, XL.3. By John D. Davis.....	638
THE NAME JOSEPH. By Oswald T. Allis.....	646
THE CHURCHMANSHIP OF WILLIAM HENRY ROBERTS. By J. Ross Stevenson	660

NOTES AND NOTICES

DR. TENNANT ON THE DIVINE OMNIPOTENCE AND THE CONCEPTION OF

A FINITE GOD. By C. W. HODGE..... 337

BOOKS REVIEWED

ABBOTT, H. P. A., <i>The Religion of the Tommy</i>	186
BARKER, J. M., <i>The Social Gospel and the New Era</i>	174
BARTON, G. A., <i>The Religion of Israel</i>	673
BENTE, F., <i>American Lutheranism</i> , Vol. I	520
BETTS, G. H., <i>How to Teach Religion</i>	358
BIEDERWOLF, W. E., <i>The Man God Tried To Kill</i>	533
BOREHAM, F. W., <i>Mountains in the Mist</i>	690
BOREHAM, F. W., <i>Mushrooms on the Moor</i>	690
BOSWORTH, E. I., <i>Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans</i>	524
BRADSHAW, M. J., <i>The War and Religion</i>	176
BROWN, W. A., <i>New Thoughts on an Old Book</i>	532
BUSHNELL, J. E., <i>Summit Views and other Sermons</i>	684
CARPENTER, S. C., <i>Christianity according to St. Luke</i>	518
CHELEY, F. H., <i>Overland for Gold</i>	698
COATES, J. R., <i>The Christ of Revolution</i>	667
COOKE, G. W., <i>The Social Evolution of Religion</i>	668
COPE, H. F., <i>Religious Education in the Church</i>	358
COPE, H. F., <i>The School in the Modern Church</i>	358
CRAWFORD, A. W., <i>Germany's Moral Downfall</i>	670
CROSTHWAITE, A., <i>The Second Epistle to the Corinthians</i>	681
CUNNINGHAM, W., <i>The Secret of Progress</i>	172
DAVIES, T. H., <i>Spiritual Voices in Modern Literature</i>	690
DENNETT, T., <i>A Better World</i>	669
DORCHESTER, D., JR., <i>Bolshevism and Social Revolt</i>	184
EDWARDS, L. M., <i>The Spectrum of Religion</i>	357
FERRAR, W. J., <i>The Early Christian Books</i>	358
FISKE, C., <i>The Perils of Respectability</i>	684
FITCH, A. P., <i>Can the Church Survive in the Changing Order?</i>	515
GALLOWAY, G., <i>The Idea of Immortality</i>	162
GIBBONS, H. A., <i>The New Map of Asia, 1900-1919</i>	692
GILLIES, A., <i>The Individualistic Gospel and Other Essays</i>	528
GORDON, A., <i>The Prophetical Literature of the Old Testament</i>	525
GORDON, S. D., <i>Quiet Talks on the Deeper Meaning of the War and its Relation to our Lord's Return</i>	682
GRAHAM, D., <i>Religion and Intellect</i>	159
GRAVES, F. P., <i>What Did Jesus Teach?</i>	688

HARRIS, C., <i>The Creeds and Modern Thought</i>	172
HASTINGS, J., (Editor), <i>The Christian Doctrine of Faith</i>	346
HEWITT, C. E., <i>The House of Judah</i>	536
HOLMES, E., <i>The Secret of the Cross</i>	178
HOLMES, J. M., <i>Jesus and the Young Man of Today</i>	355
HOUGH, L. H., <i>The Productive Beliefs</i>	531
HOUSE, E. L., <i>The Drama of the Face</i>	683
HUNTER, R., <i>Why We Fail as Christians</i>	529
HUNTING, W. B., <i>The Obligation of Contracts Clause of the United States Constitution</i>	690
JEFFERSON, C. E., <i>What the War Has Taught Us</i>	537
JOHNSON, C., <i>The Care of Documents and Management of Archives</i>	692
JOHNSON, W. J., <i>George Washington the Christian</i>	184
JONES, R. M., <i>The Story of George Fox</i>	689
JOSEPH, O. L., <i>Freedom and Advance</i>	536
KEYSER, L. S., <i>In the Redeemer's Footsteps</i>	528
KOHLER K., <i>Jewish Theology</i>	348
KRAPP, G. P., <i>Pronunciation of Standard English in America</i>	697
KUIZENGA, J. E., <i>A First Book in Catechism</i>	355
KUIZENGA, J. E., <i>A Second Book in Catechism</i>	355
LEONARD, A. W., <i>Evangelism in the Remaking of the World</i>	356
LODGE, O., <i>Reason and Belief</i>	344
MCALPIN, E. A., <i>On to Christ</i>	180
MACARTNEY, C. E., <i>Truths Tested by the World War</i>	158
MACARTNEY, C. E., <i>Spiritualism and the Word of God</i>	346
MACINTOSH, D. C., <i>Theology as an Empirical Science</i>	165
MCLEOD, M. J., <i>Songs in the Night</i>	685
MARSHALL, H. R., <i>Mind and Conduct</i>	671
MERCER, S. A. B., <i>The Book of Genesis</i>	353
MITCHELL, C. A., <i>The Model Prayer and Other New Testament Studies</i>	183
MICKLEM, N., <i>The Open Light</i>	157
MOORE, W. W., <i>A Real Boy Scout</i>	536
MORGAN, G. C., <i>The Ministry of the Word</i>	533
<i>Partial Report on Definition of a Unit of Bible Study</i>	358
PATTON, C. H., <i>World Facts and America's Responsibility</i>	362
PECK, G. C., <i>Forgotten Faces</i>	685
PENNIMAN, J. H., <i>A Book about the English Bible</i>	354
PENTECOST, G. F., <i>Fighting for Faith</i>	179
PFATTEICHER, E. P., <i>Sermons on the Gospels, Advent to Trinity</i> ..	686
<i>Religion Among American Men</i>	686
REU, M., <i>How I Tell the Bible Stories to My Sunday School</i>	534
RICE, W. N., <i>The Poet of Science and Other Addresses</i>	181
RICHARDSON, N. E., <i>Religious Education and Reconstruction</i>	358
RICHARDSON, N. E., <i>Moral Education as a Reconstruction Problem</i> ..	358
ROBERTSON, A. T., <i>The New Citizenship</i>	177
ROBERTSON, A. T., <i>Studies in Mark's Gospel</i>	355
ROBERTSON, J. A., <i>The Gospel and the Epistles of St. John</i>	525

SANDAY, W., <i>Divine Overruling</i>	516
SCHALLER, J., <i>Biblical Christology</i>	677
SCHLISTER, F., <i>Religion and Culture</i>	158
SCHMAUK, T. E., <i>How to Teach in Sunday School</i>	534
SIMPSON, W. J. S., <i>Broad Church Theology</i>	523
SINGER, I., <i>The Rival Philosophies of Jesus and of Paul</i>	519
SKEETH, W. C., <i>Building the Congregation</i>	357
SLOANE, W. M., <i>The Powers and Aims of Western Democracy</i> ...	537
SMITH, H. M., <i>The Training of the Clergy</i>	681
SNOWDEN, J. H., <i>Is the World Growing Better?</i>	160
SOARES, T. G., <i>Studies in Comradeship: Old Testament</i>	358
SOARES, T. G., <i>Studies in Comradeship: New Testament</i>	357
SPITTA, F., <i>Die Auferstehung Jesu</i>	173
STANFIELD, J. M., <i>Christ's Second Coming</i>	348
STIGER, W. L., <i>Soldier Silhouettes on Our Front</i>	185
SWEET, L. M., <i>The Verification of Christianity</i>	343
<i>The American Jewish Year Book, 5680</i>	533
<i>The Presbyterian Handbook</i>	533
TIPLADY, T., <i>Social Christianity in the New Era</i>	176
Tolstoï, Léon, <i>Journal Intime, 1895-1910</i>	699
WARING, H. F., <i>Christianity's Unifying Fundamental</i>	180
WEBBER, A. B., <i>Apt Illustrations for Public Address</i>	689
WEST, W. B., <i>The Fight for the Argonne</i>	187
WILSON, P. W., <i>The Church We Forget</i>	526
WOODHOUSE, A. S., <i>The Relation between Religion and Science</i> ...	666
WYLIE, R. C., <i>Collapse of Christless Civilization</i>	689

CONTRIBUTORS

- ALISON, J., 686-688.
- ALLIS, O. T., 348-353, **646-659**, 673-677, 699.
- ARMSTRONG, W. P., 173-174.
- BEACH, S. W., 185-187, 526-528.
- DAVIS, J. D., **256-268**, **638-645**.
- DULLES, J. H., 690-692.
- ERDMAN, C. R., 354-356, 357-358, 524-526, 528, 532-534, 536, 681-690.
- FENN, C. H., **229-255**, 692-697.
- FOX, J., **193-228**.
- GAGE, D. S., **123-156**, 536-537.
- GREENE, W. B., JR., 157-160, 162-165, 174-177, 184, 343-346, 515-518,
537-538, 666-671, 690.
- HODGE, C. W., 165-172, 337-342, 346-348, 523.
- JOHNSON, G., 172-173, 358-362, 671-673.
- MACARTNEY, C. E., 356-357, **369-398**.
- MACHEN, J. G., 518-520.
- MONTGOMERY, R., 688-690, 698-699.
- PAIST, B. F., JR., 362-363, 520-522, 677-680.
- RAMSAY, F. P., 353-354.
- RUSSELL, G. M., 160-162.
- SMITH, H. W., 698.
- SMITH, J. R., 177-183, 528-532, 682-686.
- STEVENSON, J. R., 660-665.
- VAN BAALEN, J. K., **493-514**, **611-637**.
- VERKUYL, G., 534-536.
- VOS, G., **1-43**.
- WARFIELD, B. B., 44-102, **269-336**, **399-459**, **545-610**.
- WILSON, R. D., **103-122**, **460-492**.

Articles are indicated by black-faced type; Notes and Notices by italics.

**Introduction by J. Ross Stevenson, D.D., President
Princeton Seminary**

CHINA FROM WITHIN

CHARLES ERNEST SCOTT

New York Tribune says: "Dr. Scott has lived so long in China and has come into so close touch with its people that he is able to write with exceptional knowledge, together with an entertaining style and a pleasant gift of humor."

Louisville Courier-Journal says: "Of absorbing interest. The author has an unusual faculty for understanding the psychology of this baffling race—a faculty which gives him special sympathy with their best qualities. Those who desire to acquaint themselves with the wonderful resources of China, its present condition and future possibilities, will find Dr. Scott's book a mine of well-classified information."

Boston Evening Transcript says: "Dr. Scott has not only journeyed over the greater part of China, but he has lived among the people, learning their real life. Teacher and administrator, his broad experience and his close and sympathetic study of present-day conditions, little understood by foreigners, renders his book as interesting and valuable to the general reader as to those concerned with the problems of mission work."

N. Y. Sun says: "A book charged with a spirit of faithful presentation, and furnishing a mass of refreshingly new material. During recent years, China has been written up, and around, to an almost wearying extent, and it would appear to be a difficult matter to set forth anything really new concerning her. But whatever difficulty the effort may have involved, Dr. Scott seems to have been able to surmount it, for he provides his readers with a striking and engrossing account of the inner life of China such as is extremely hard to come by in the long list of books devoted to a study of conditions in the Far East."

Record of Christian Work says: "A very interesting view of conditions in the 'Land of Sinim' by a distinguished missionary. Dr. Scott has enjoyed many opportunities, not only to view the land, but also to come close to the hearts of the people. He has evidently been a good 'mixer,' but is not on that account any less a kindly and discriminating critic. He writes with a serious sympathy which will commend his book to Chinese as well as to American readers. He has succeeded in providing the public with a striking and impressive account of the inner life of the country. The book is embellished with a number of illustrations."

Impressions and Experiences of an Itinerating Evangelist

Cloth Binding, \$2.00 net

At All Booksellers or of the Publishers.

Fleming H. Revell Company

**New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 17 N. Wabash Avenue**

COUNTERFEIT MIRACLES

By BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1918. 8vo, pp. vi, 327. Price, \$2.00 net.

"One opens this book with no especial eagerness of expectation. The title makes no very urgent appeal. It sounds remote and scholastic, and we turn to the perusal of the book as one girds himself for a task that will be laborious and probably wearisome. This impression is quickly dispelled. The reviewer has the impression that the most illuminating introduction he can give to this work will be simply to put on record his own unbounded delight in the reading of it. What is it? A thoroughgoing review of extra-biblical, religious thaumaturgy from early Christian times to the present day. . . This whole subject needed exploration by a competent student, with adequate historical apparatus and with sufficiently critical mind to sift the evidence and to undertake the careful and judicious discrimination which is the first condition of dealing with problems so varied and complex. Dr. Warfield has done his work thoroughly and well. Every minister, teacher, and intelligent Christian layman with a sense of contemporary needs and dangers should not only read the discussion but become acquainted with the literature to which reference is made."—Louis M. Sweet, in *The Biblical Review*.

THE ACTS

An Exposition By CHARLES R. ERDMAN. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1919. Crown 8vo., pp. 176. Cloth, 75 cents net.

"Professor Charles R. Erdman of Princeton has published through the Westminster Press, Philadelphia, an exposition on "The Acts" which will be welcome to every sincere student of the Scriptures. The wonderful story of rapid expansion of the Christian Church as recorded in "The Acts" is here made more vivid and vital. Professor Erdman's explanations and interpretations constitute a new revelation of this record of heroic achievement and inspired eloquence."—*The New Era Magazine*.

THE WALL AND THE GATES

By J. RITCHIE SMITH. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1919. 8vo., pp. 278. Price \$1.50 net.

"Some Sermons are edifying and some are otherwise. This book belongs emphatically in the former class. There is instruction, consolation, enthusiasm, encouragement, visions and foundations for everyone. To glance at its table of contents inspires hope; a perusal of its pages deepens faith, and to sit with it for an evening makes one feel stronger and nearer to his Master when he gets down upon his knees. There is scholarship and literature in happy combination. The Scriptures are richly interpreted and the spirituality of the book will commend it to all who love God."—*The United Presbyterian*.

STUDIES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

A Discussion of the Historical Questions. By ROBERT DICK WILSON. New York and London: G. F. Putnam's Sons; The Knickerbocker Press, 1917. 8vo, pp. xvi, 402. Price, \$3.50.

"It is difficult within a short space to give an adequate account of the way in which Professor Wilson acquits himself in the task of meeting all the objections that adroit and learned combatants have been alleging with a view to undermine faith in the historical character of Daniel and his prophecies. He seems always to take the statements of some at least of the Higher Critics almost more seriously than the critics themselves, and then institutes an inquiry about as thorough as in the nature of the case is possible, with the result that the conclusion is forced upon us that after all the Destructive Critics have mistaken their own *ipse dixit*s for evidence, and baseless assumptions for the conclusions of an inductive science."—John R. Mackay, in *The Monthly Record of the Free Church of Scotland*.

ELECTION

By BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1918. 16mo, pp. 22. Price, Ten cents.

"A strong, forceful and instructive setting forth of the Scripture teaching as to this great doctrine of divine grace."—*The Herald and Presbyterian*.